

Are parents showing pushy parenting traits on online discussion forums?

Emily Holland

1300891

MSc Family and Child Psychology

PS7112 Research Dissertation

2016/2017

University of Chester

Are parents showing pushy parenting traits on online  
discussion forums?

Word count – 15,263

## **Declaration**

This work is original and has not been submitted in relation to any other degree or qualification.

Signed:

Date:

**With thanks to my supervisor Julian Lloyd for his assistance with this piece of research.**



## Department of Psychology

### Research Module Meeting Log 2016/2017

NAME: Emily Holland

SUPERVISOR: Dr Julian Lloyd

<b>Date</b>	<b>Discussion topics</b>
01/02/17	Introduction to individual project factors that influence the relationships between parental acceptance-rejection and psychological adjustment. Ideas were suggested surrounding interests (fathers accepting or rejecting their children) and discussion involved variable to be explored (self-esteem and resilience), potential participants (fathers), data collection (questionnaires' handed out at school where I am employed) and data analysis (quantitative - statistics).
14/03/17	Resources and reading surrounding interest of impact of father's acceptance and rejection on child's resilience were sent via email.
15/03/17	Met with supervision with other dissertation student to discuss approach to dissertation, measures and procedures. Ideas for dissertation were clarified and decided upon.
27/03/17	Discussed measures – PARQ via email.
13/04/17	Variables scales discussed via email – resilience and self-esteem scale.

18/04/17	Started to discuss format and layout of Ethics form and how to complete via email.
28/04/17	Ethics form sent to supervisor to read through and suggest improvements.
04/05/17	Ethics form sent back from supervisor with amendments to be made.
05/05/17	Ethics form sent.
22/05/17	Ethics form was fully rejected by ethics committee.
25/05/17	Met with supervisor to discuss rejected ethics form and began to start discussing a different topic surrounding a content analysis of Mumnet for pushy parent.
28/05/17	Examples of relevant literature sent via email and discussed methods and procedures and outlined a data sampling strategy.
30/05/17	Phone call discussing the new ethics form.
31/05/17	Met with supervisor to discuss finalising project and refining ethics form ready for submission.
02/06/17	New ethics form sent off to be reviewed by the ethics committee.
20/06/17	Ethics form was fully accepted. Discussed with supervisor.
05/07/17	Discussed sample size and layout of dissertation via email.
14/07/17	Discussed research strategy and data collection via email.
19/07/17	Met with supervisor alongside other dissertation student to discuss the layout and requirements of dissertation. Went through each section in great detail with advice and suggestions on what to include and how to structure. Date of draft reading decided.
24/07/17	Introduction and Methods section of dissertation sent to supervisor for review.
10/08/17	Feedback from introduction and methods sections sent back from supervisor.

15/08/17	Discussed how to perform a content analysis with some examples attached via email.
19/08/17	Support given by supervisor on how to run a chi-square test.
05/09/17	Dissertation sent to supervisor for a draft reading.

SIGNED

STUDENT \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

SUPERVISOR \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## Table of contents

Title page and word count	2
Declaration	3
Acknowledgements	4
Supervision log	5
Table of content	8
List of tables and figures	10
<b>1. Abstract</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2. Introduction</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2.1 Pushy Parenting</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2.2 Ongoing debate surrounding Pushy Parents</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2.3 History of Pushy Parenting</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>2.4 Psychological impacts</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>2.5 Traits of a Pushy Parent</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>2.6 Pushy Parents in a school environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>2.7 Online parenting advice</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>2.8 Main rationale</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>3. Method</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>3.1 Online discussion forums</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>3.2 Mumsnet</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>3.3 Why Mumsnet?</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>3.4 Ethics</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3.5 Data source</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>3.6 Coding frame</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>3.7 Data analysis</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>4. Findings and Discussions</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>4.1 Hypothesis 1</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>4.2 Hypotheses 2 and 3</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>4.3 Hypotheses 4 and 5</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>4.4 Other significant findings</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>4.5 Psychological findings</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>4.6 Implications</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>4.7 Limitations</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>5. Conclusion</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>6. References</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>7. Appendices</b>	<b>96</b>



Appendix B – Coded Data	129
Appendix C – Ethics form	133
Appendix D - CD attached to rear cover	

# List of Tables

## Tables

Table 1 Developed Codes

Table 2 Information about the sources of data collection

Table 3 Example of how codes emerged from the data

Table 4 Example of how the data was recorded once coded

Table 5 Relationship between gender and mothers making  
academic decisions

Table 6 Relationship between gender and mother interfering  
with extra-curricular activities

Table 7 Relationship between orientation displayed towards the  
child and educator from the mother

Table 8 Relationship between competitive pushy parenting trait and  
orientation displayed towards the child

Table 9 Relationship between mother having high expectations and  
orientation displayed towards the educator

Table 10 Is the behaviour in the child's best interest and is it justifiable?

Table 11 Relationship between how the mother is viewed and whether  
her behaviour is in the best interest of the child

Table 12 Relationship between how the mother is viewed and whether  
her behaviour has been justified

### **Abstract**

More parents are turning to online discussion forums for security, advice, support, empowerment and to share their parenting experiences. This naturalistic setting is becoming more prominent form of data collection within psychological research, observing human behaviour in natural manner. Many parenting styles are widely acknowledged, but little research has been performed surrounding pushy parenting. Pushy parenting behaviours can be evident and associated within an educational context. Therefore, this study aims to explore online discussion forums for evidence of pushy parenting behavioural traits. Content analytical approaches were applied on a popular parenting website Mumsnet. A coding scheme was devised from the existing literature and was applied to one hundred discussions from nine threads related to education where there was clear evidence of pushy parenting characteristics. 2x2 Chi-square tests were run to establish any significant relationships between the variables stated as the hypotheses. Findings suggest that there is a significant relationship between the gender of the child and pushy parenting, the orientation displayed towards the child and the child's educator and whether the behaviour is considered in the child's best interests and the reasons given making the behaviour justifiable.

## **Introduction**

This study aims to find out whether parents in the UK are seen to be displaying pushy parenting behaviours online. If so, identification will show what these behaviours are, whether they are justifiable and are in the child's best interest. The relationship between the pushy parent and the gender of their child will also be considered. The behaviours will be analysed to determine whether there is a link between the pushy parent's behaviours and the gender of the child and whether the behaviour is associated with a negative or positive orientation towards the educator and the child. Pushy parenting behaviours will be explored through online parenting discussion forums within an educational context. Studying natural behaviours surrounding online discussions where there is indirect evidence of pushy parenting behaviour based on the language used, experience talked about and the opinions demonstrated is an under used way of analysing data (Beauvais, 2017). Pushy parenting is also a developing construct within parenting, psychological and educational research (Hiltz, 2015; Fingerman, Cheng, Wesselmann, Zarit, Furstenberg & Birditt, 2012).

## **Pushy Parenting**

Pushy parenting is seen to be a vague and culturally-specific label, capturing a forceful and self-centred parenting style (Sullivan, 2013; Morawska & Sanders, 2009) where a parent is unsuitably and inappropriately invested within their child (Beauvais, 2017). Pushy parents aim for their child to achieve highly by creating and allowing their child to experience a pressured environment in which they are expected to excel, these children are known as 'trophy-children' (Cigman, 2006; Winstanley, 2004; Freeman, 2010). These definitions of pushy parenting can be associated with perfectionism, the pressures of holding excessively high standards (Stoeber & Otto, 2006; Snell, Overbey & Brewer, 2005). Parents are setting themselves higher expectations to perform as parents (Lee, Schoppe-Sullivan &

Kamp Dush, 2012), which is increasing the excessively high standards they set for their children (Hamachek, 1978). However, many of these children who do well under pressure from their parents cannot realistically and consistently achieve these expectations in everyday life, it is not a true representation of their ability from parents who are setting unrealistic goals of their child's development (Stone, 2010; Segrin, Givertz, Swaitkowski & Montgomery, 2015).

Similarly, pushy parents can be overly demanding and oblivious to their child's needs and development (Freeman, 1991), they tend to make decisions for their children such as academic decisions and what extracurricular and sporting activities to partake in (Pfeiffer & Stocking, 2000; Holt, Tamminen, Black, Mandigo & Fox, 2009). However, a major problem with this kind of application is the impact upon the child's autonomy, the freedom to make one's own choices (Deci and Ryan, 2008), and sense of willingness (Vansteenkiste, Ryan, & Deci, 2008), which is reiterated throughout the self-determination theory (SDT). SDT is a social theory exploring motivation and personality (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000). Autonomous motivation consists of intrinsic and internalized motives where a person wants to engage due to holding an interest, seeing it as being meaningful or to support one's beliefs, therefore they will perform the behaviour willingly (Soenens & Vansteenkiste, 2010). Yet, in contrast with autonomous motivation and linking to pushy parenting, is controlled motivation. Controlled motivation is the guidance of behaviour by external factors that control and manipulate behaviour through pressured situations such as people having high expectations (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Hence, pushy and controlling parenting styles have been seen to violate children's basic psychological needs for autonomy (Segrin, Wosidlo, Givertz, Bauer & Murphy, 2012; Schiffrin, Liss, Miles-McLean, Geary, Erchull & Tashner, 2014).

Although, another perception of pushy parents is the parent trying to live their life and re-live their own childhood vicariously through their own child (Marino, 2014). Linked to this, a study conducted by Musher-Eizenman & Kiefner (2013) exploring food parenting discusses parent's influences on the decisions they make for their children, such as what they personally like and dislike and how young children are unable to make these decisions and choices independently. This can be related the pushy parenting as parents can be seen to make decisions based on their own experiences for their children to excel and achieve highly and perhaps follow in their own footsteps or achieve something the parent has always dreamed of achieving (Ashbourne & Andres, 2015). This view is supported by Schaefer (1965) who writes about psychological control, a construct involving many aspects of control in this instance psychologically controlling parents who display traits of guilt tripping (Grolnick, 2003), being highly involved, demonstrating invasive behaviours, exhibiting dictating and selfish attitudes (Barber & Harmon, 2002) and being overprotective (Parker, 1983). Barber (1996) defines psychological control as a social influence pressuring changes in behaviour through deception that is not complementary of one's emotional and psychological needs. This psychological control can relate to pushy parenting as the forcefulness of the parent for the children to compete or perform, may not be of an interest to the child, but they will still meet the expectations in order to please their parent (Assor, Roth, & Deci, 2004).

### **Ongoing debate surrounding Pushy Parents**

However, a strong argument made when exploring pushy parenting is determining whether a parent's pushiness is a result of support and encouragement or control and forcefulness (Stone, 2010; Mageau, Bureau, Ranger, Allen & Soenens, 2016). This has resulted in an unclear, indefinite dispute of where to draw the line between the parents who want their children to succeed but allow them to do this in a supportive way that is

developmentally appropriately or parents who make their children successful through force, stress and pressure (Howe, 1990; Levine, 2003; Reid, Roberts, Roberts & Piek, 2015). Pushy parents want their children to achieve and be successful, therefore some people argue whether this is within the child's best interest (Rubie-Davies, Peterson, Irving, Widdowson & Dixon, 2010; Wu, 2008). Some parents also encourage their children to excel and take part in many activities which the child may not have previously established an interest in, thought of taking part in or simply could not make the decision independently (Moore, Burland & Davidson, 2003; Dwairy, 2004). Therefore, due to the unclarity of the definite categorisation of pushiness and encouragement, certain behaviours are uncertain as to whether they can be classified as being 'pushy' (Ablard & Parker, 1997; Hiltz, 2015).

### **History of Pushy Parenting**

The phenomena of 'pushy parents' first arose within traditional Asian cultures such as the Chinese, who implement pushy parenting traits such as having high academic expectations, putting their child under pressure to achieve and ensuring their child always succeeds from an early age (Wieteska, 2017; Koshy, 2013; Göransson, 2015). A book written by Chua in 2011, emphasised her own traditional Chinese values and parenting practices such as setting boundaries for her children to achieve high grades, implementing sanctions if they did not perform to a grade A and pushing them to take part in extracurricular activities (Lui & Rollock, 2013). Although argued was the generalisation of Chinese parenting and how it was negatively portrayed (Cheah, Leung & Zhou, 2013), some recognised that this parenting style is attracting negativity when the parent is attempting to ensure bright, stable futures for their children (Dermott & Pomati, 2016).

Although extreme and controversial, behavioural traits of these parents are beginning to become evident within American and European cultures (Chan, Chan & Chan, 2013; Wu,

2008; Yi, 2013), with added pressures from Governments to compete within academic league tables (Grek, 2009), such as David Cameron praising and supporting Chua's (2011) tiger, pushy parenting and wanting to incorporate it in social policy (Cocozza, 2016). However, different cultures interpret and apply parent styles suited to their lives (Chao, 2001; Su & Hynie, 2011), reiterating that traditional parenting in China has only influenced pushy parenting and has been adapted to suit a British society (Rochelle & Cheng, 2016). Within European cultures, middle-class parents have been found the most likely to intentionally push for their child to have the most advantage within education (Vincent & Ball, 2007; James, Reay, Crozier, Beedell, Hollingworth, Jamieson & Williams, 2010). Although middle-class parents engage within this behaviour they fail to recognise and label themselves as a 'pushy parent' (Archer, 2010). Middle-class pushy parents are more likely to get away with 'cheating' the education system and making their children out to be brighter or more talented than they are (Beauvais, 2017). Whereas working-class parents are more aware of the label of 'pushy parents' (Crozier, 2000).

With the literature suggesting cultural influences are making more of an impact upon European parenting styles, there is a need to explore how evident pushy parenting is within the UK. Further literature will explore some of the negative psychological outcomes of pushy parenting in children, identify the traits of pushy parenting, relate and recognise these traits in a school environment and the explore the orientations pushy parents show towards to child (and any difference in gender) and the educator. This will be done to support the stance of this research, to identify patterns and themes within pushy parenting and explore whether these are apparent in a naturalistic environment and whether this is associated with a negative or positive orientation towards the educator and the child.

### **Psychological impacts**



One of the main issues with pushy parenting behaviours is that certain elements have been linked to negative psychological outcomes in children. This section will focus on some of these negative outcomes. Previously discussed in the reduction of a child's autonomous motivation (Deci and Ryan, 2008), with pushy parents violating a child's freedom to make decisions (Ryan & Connell, 1989). Rather creating a controlling environment where the child is either rewarded or punished for meeting or not meeting the expectations of the parents (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

Research suggests that pushing children may cause them to become obsessive and compulsive; a perfectionist (Miller, Lambert, & Speirs Neumeister, 2012; Hibbard & Walton, 2014). Although this allows children to strive for the best (Jeynes, 2010; Watson, Sanders-Lawson & McNeal, 2012), it also encourages children to experience extreme doubts and worries for making mistakes (Kawamura, Frost, & Harmatz, 2002), which can be classed as 'psychological abuse' (Sheriff, 2013). This self-doubt may enhance children of pushy parents to be a subject to mental health problems (Morawska & Sanders, 2009), such as anxiety and depression (Cross & Cross, 2015). The competitive nature of pushy parents can also cause children to develop anxiety especially if they are expected to perform to a certain level and meet high expectations (Bois, Lalanne & Delforge, 2009).

Even though there are negative outcomes of pushy parents, this parenting style can also increase a child's motivation (Matthias Arnold & Javorcik, 2009; Wang & Neihart, 2015). It has been found that parents who want the best for their children by encouraging and pushing them to achieve their best, influences children to challenge themselves to the best of their ability (Garn, Matthews & Jolly, 2012). However, this reiterates the argument of the line between 'forcefulness', which has serious negative psychological effects and 'encouragement', which can have beneficial impacts (Stone, 2010; Howe, 1990; Levine, 2003).

### **Traits of a Pushy Parent**

This section will now explore and identify themes within the pushy parenting literature to define key characteristics of this parenting style. When exploring definitions of pushy parenting characteristics and behavioural traits become apparent to this parenting style (Beauvais, 2017), especially with links to education (Vaughan, 2013). Pushy parenting is mainly linked to wanting children to gain academic success and achieve highly (Freeman, 2010; Mandigo & Fox, 2009). Parents feel more pressure for their child to be deemed as being 'bright' and successful (Deary, Batty, Pattie & Gale, 2008; Bosetti & Pyryt, 2007; Bicknell, 2014) and are therefore taking it in their stride to ensure this is achieved (Naumann, Guillaume & Funder, 2012; Jacobs & Harvey, 2005). This pressure may have emerged from Government pressures for children to achieve highly to compete in league tables (Grek, 2009), with greater expectations of children being set from a younger age (Tucker, 2010; Smith, 2010). Therefore, one of the key traits of being a pushy parent is parents making and pressuring academic successes, decision and achievements (Beauvais, 2017). Female students in school are seen to perform better academically than male's due to holding greater pride and higher achievement motivation (Fischer, Schult & Hell, 2013; Ellis, Hershberger, Field, Wersinger, Pellis & Geary, 2008). Although, it is important to note that this does not account for intelligence and rather just performance (Halpern, 2000). Hence, with this research taken into account, pushy parents may show more academic attention to their child if they are female.

Similarly, a second characteristic are the pressures pushy parents are holding over their children to take part in and interfere with extracurricular activities (Saner, 2015). Extracurricular activities can be defined as the activities that take part outside of the set curriculum, activities that go beyond what is normally expected (Bartkus, Nemelka, Nemelka & Gardner, 2012). Although recognised are the benefits of extracurricular activities on

education experience (Cole, Rubin, Field & Giles, 2007), pushy parents tend to centre their child's life around these activities, going above and beyond to ensure their child is the best, even though the child may not have a say or made the decision to take part in the activity that the parent is seen to be pushing them into completing (Ashbourne & Andres, 2015; Assor, Roth, & Deci, 2004). This links to another distinct trait of pushy parents, competitiveness (Halliwell, 2015). Parents feel they have the responsibility to push their children to compete against other children to succeed, stand out and have a bright future (Lucey & Reay, 2002). Key examples of pushy parenting and competitiveness tend to be evident within activities involving sports (Livingston, Schmidt, & Lehman, 2016) and music (Youm, 2013). Parents may pressure their children to succeed in order for them to 'show off' their children as being the best, this enhances competitiveness (Cigman, 2006; Lavoie & Stellino, 2008). It has been found that boys show greater importance towards sport than girls do (Van Deventer & Malan, 2013), with girls preferring a non-competitive setting (Niederle & Vesterlund, 2007). With this in mind, research suggests that parents tend to show more of a competitive nature within extracurricular activities if their child is male (Kane, 2012; Gurian, Henley & Trueman, 2000), which may have links to pushy parenting and extra-curricular activities and the gender of their child.

Not only does competitiveness in pushy parenting relate to sports and extracurricular activities, but also academically with findings in a newspaper titled 'Why pushy parents can lead to pupils being wrongly diagnosed' (2017), parents imply a range of things to gain a competitive edge in academic activities. Some parents have even been found to stop activities that seem to be effecting their child's academic achievements to ensure they compete and are top of the class (Friedman, 2014).

Lastly, as reiterated throughout the literature are pushy parents having high, but developmentally inappropriate expectations (Rubie-Davies, Peterson, Irving, Widdowson &

Dixon, 2010; Chambers, 2006). For example, expecting their 5-year-old child to attend a different extracurricular club every night of the week. This proves not to be developmentally appropriate as children need time to simply be children, play and relax (McEntire, 2009). Developmentally inappropriate parenting can cause children to have reduced levels of autonomy and competence, leading to higher levels of mental health and lower life satisfaction (Schiffrin, Liss, Miles-McLean, Geary, Erchull & Tashner, 2014). Although it has been found that having high expectations of children can develop greater independence and autonomy and acquire sustained attention (Clarke-Stewart, Lee, Allhusen, Kim & McDowell, 2006). Similarly, a study found that high levels of involvement and support throughout life enable children a better well-being and greater life satisfaction (Fingerman, Cheng, Wesselmann, Zarit, Furstenberg & Birditt, 2012). However, these studies explored high levels of support from parents, not having direct links to pushy parenting.

### **Pushy Parents in a school environment**

As mentioned above, these specific traits of pushy parenting are mainly evident within a school environment (Sallis, 2006; Manos, 2009). There is great discussion between parent-teacher relationships (Santiago, Garbacz, Beattie & Moore, 2016) and parental involvement in education (Hornby & Lafaele, 2011), with one of the battles being pushy parents (Beauvais, 2017). Although recognised is the importance of parental involvement within their child's education to ensure the child's needs are being met and they are making significant progress by establishing effective communication with the educator (Hoover-Dempsey, Walker, Sandler, Whetsel, Green, Wilkins & Closson, 2005; Jeynes, 2010), the question is raised of when too much involvement is deemed detrimental to the child and becomes a burden on the educator. It has been said that parents know their children the best as they are their own and have brought them up, but teachers know children greater academically and have greater expertise within this area (Hughes & Read, 2012; Whitney,

2004). Therefore, these skills combined positively can be beneficial for the child (Athey, 2006; Harris & Goodall, 2008). It is when there is an overpower where problems arise (Broomhead, 2014).

Pushy parents tend to argue and make complaints against teachers based upon the teaching and learning of their children (Denholm, 2016; Huff, Houskamp, Watkins, Stanton & Tavegia, 2005). With high academic expectations of their children (Freeman, 2010), pushy parents like to be heavily involved (Winstanley, 2004) and sometimes push teachers to commit to a decision which may not be beneficial to the child, therefore the parent is making a decision based upon what they want their child to achieve (Archer, 2010). Equally, some 'bright' children can be overlooked by teachers as they are seen to 'understand', hence the need for parents to intervene (Smith, 2006; Robinson & Campbell, 2010). However, Cigman (2006) argues, that is part of the teacher's role to use their professional expertise and work alongside parents and advise them as to what is best for their children.

Most pushy parenting behaviour in education is widely observed through the notion of children who are perceived to be 'gifted and talented' (Jolly & Matthews, 2012). Defining children as 'gifted' and 'talented' has proven to be a tricky concept within education with difficulties interpreting the characteristics of being G&T or children just being 'bright' (Koshy & Pinheiro- Torres, 2013). However, a G&T child can be defined as exceptionally achieving above national average, confidently and competently (Goodhew, 2009; Glass, 2004). Parents feel they need to be pushy when their 'gifted' or 'talented' child is not being seen to be challenged enough and fall into the background (Rotigel, 2003; Morawska & Sanders, 2008). Although, teachers have reported that this undermines their own professional expertise and causes friction within the parent-teacher relationship (Lightfoot, 2009; Lang, Tolbert, Schoppe-Sullivan & Bonomi, 2016). But, parents still argue that they know what is best for their children best and want them to do well in school (Hughes & Read, 2012;

Espinoza, 2016). Again, this reiterates the debate over where to draw the line between 'pushiness' and 'supportive' (Stone, 2010; Howe, 1990; Levine, 2003) and the question is raised of how involved should parents be in making academic decisions for their children.

Though most parents blame educators for their children's academic underachievement's, it has also been found that the pushy parent might put pressure on and blame their own child for their underachievement's even if the child might not be 'bright', the fault is the child for not meeting the expectations and working hard enough (Underdown, 2007; Alstott, 2004; Miller, 2010). However, many pushy parents fail to recognise that placing excessive pressure on their children to achieve unrealistic results has negative academic results, reducing academic motivations and engagement to learning (Hurst, 2015; Schiffrin & Liss, 2017). Although, it has been found that this is more applicable with adolescents as appose to children (Stoeber & Rambow, 2007; Janssens, Goossens, Van Den Noortgate, Colpin, Verschueren & Van Leeuwen, 2015). With parents with primary aged children blaming teachers for not stretching or challenging their children and for the academic underachievement's from their children (Denholm, 2016; Archer, 2010).

Most pushy parents tend to show a positive orientation towards their 'gifted and talented child' (Bicknell, 2014; Hargrove, 2013). Many pushy parents want to believe their child is 'gifted' or 'talented' and like to show this off to other parents and educators (Sutherland, 2012; Macintyre, 2008). Most parents believe that their child is the best at everything they do and is their prized possession (Knass, 2013; Sime & Sheridan, 2014). Yet, some children of pushy parents, where there is the belief that their child is gifted or talented, are not naturally 'bright', with the pushy parent cheating the system and allowing their child to succeed unfairly or the child is gifted or talented and being overlooked (Beauvais, 2017). Similarly, in many cases the child is not naturally gifted or talented, but rather trained to display traits of being G&T by the pushy parent (Cigman, 2006). Either way the pushy parent

still wants the best for their child, whether that is what they want or what their child wants (Winstanley, 2004), and tends to blame educators for their child's underperformance or underachievement's (Manos, 2009; Denholm, 2016).

### **Online parenting advice**

It has been found that parents, especially mothers are using the internet more to seek and gain parenting advice and support (Lamberton, Devaney & Bunting, 2016), with parenting websites being widely accessible (Pedersen & Smithson, 2013). Mothers feel they can gain guidance in a non-judgemental and anonymous way (O'Connor & Madge, 2004). Similarly, a study conducted by Valaitis & Sword (2005) found that parents preferred discussion online rather than face-to-face discussions. Mothers are turning to online discussions to share and explore experiences (Drentea & Moren-Cross, 2005). There has been research which suggests that the mothers using online forums who obviously have access to the internet are more economically advantaged and come from higher social class than mothers who are not seeking advice online (Plantin & Daneback, 2009). This has direct links with pushy parents as they tend to be middle to upper-middle class (Lareau, 2003; Brantlinger, 2003). However, it has been found that this is not always true, with a range of mothers from social economic backgrounds accessing online forums (Sarkadi & Bremberg, 2005).

Using online forums is a good opportunity for parents to be involved within confrontational and opinionated discussion (Pedersen & Smithson, 2013), but also let off some frustration and anger (Porter & Ispa, 2013). Online forums have been seen to give mothers empowerment within their parenting style (Madge & O'Connor, 2006; Na & Chia, 2008), with mothers normalising and transforming their parenting style to reassure they are a 'good mother' (Mackenzie, 2017). Similarly, it has been found that the Intensive Mothering

ideal is most frequently discussed within parenting discussions (Pedersen, 2016). This relates to a pushy parent's behavioural traits as they may use online discussions to debate, 'rant' and blame for why their child is not meeting their high expectations. Likewise, pushy parents might use online forums to compete with other parents, 'show off' their children and complain about other children and parents (Mangan, 2016).

Hence, the question is raised are pushy parents showing pushy traits on online discussion forums and is there an association between negative or positive orientations towards either the educator and the child?

### **Main rationale**

Overall, following the review of the little, existing, indirect literature into pushy parenting there is a need for pushy parenting to be explored further. This is important as it is an under researched parenting style that can have psychological impacts on young children. Likewise, a clearer definition is needed into the subtle differences between 'pushiness' and 'supportive', to help professionals working within an educational setting identify and work alongside pushy parents. This will also be beneficial for parents to gain an insight into whether they are too involved within their child's life. With more parents using online discussions to disclose and discuss a range of topics including parent styles, there is an opportunity to explore pushy parenting traits within a naturalistic, underexplored area. With this in mind, the aim of this research is to find out whether parents in the UK are seen to be displaying pushy parenting behaviours and whether this is associated with a negative or positive orientation towards the educator and the child.

The hypotheses therefore are:

1. There will be an association between pushy parenting behaviour and whether the child is a girl or a boy (with more behaviour being shown towards girls than boys).



2. There will be an association between pushy parenting behaviour and positive comments/orientation towards the child (with more behaviour being associated with positive comments about the child).
3. There will be an association between pushy parenting behaviour and negative comments/orientation towards the educator (with more behaviour being associated with negative comments about the educator).
4. The parent displaying the behaviour will not have the child's best interest at heart when displaying certain behaviours and will instead present selfish tendencies.
5. The pushy parent will provide justification for their behaviour due to their high expectations to achieve of both the child and the educator.

## Methods

### Online discussion forums

This study draws on a content analysis of one hundred users' comments attached to nine threads, posted onto a popular parenting website in the United Kingdom. The popular online website provides parents, of which 95% of the users are mothers (Mumsnet census, 2009) with the opportunity to start a discussion and add to the forums. A range of threads were explored to gather a range of behavioural traits in different situations and circumstances, adding to the richness of the data. The decision to focus on the actual content produced by the users was made due to the needs of observing behaviour and analysing content in an underused domain of online discussion forums associated with parenting, which has not adopted within the methods of other studies exploring pushy parenting

The study is primarily concerned with the ways in which users are displaying pushy parenting behaviours towards their child in an educational context and whether this is associated with a negative or positive orientation towards the child or the educator. Therefore, the primary goal is to explore whether pushy parenting behaviours are evident within a naturalistic setting online, whether the gender of the child impacts the pushiness of the behaviour and to what extent the behaviours are portraying negative or positive outcomes.

This form of data collection was applied due to the increased popular means of communicating and receiving support in a wide range of places, including online (Arden, Duxbury & Soltani, 2014). Using online forums to collect data can be a powerful resource for many reasons, such as people finding it easier to express their 'true selves' behind a screen (Mandiberg, 2012; Hadert & Rodham, 2008), with the anonymity of the internet displaying different behaviours to that in a social face-to-face context (Jung-Tae, Min-Chul & Hae-Chang, 2014). As well as this, it enables researchers a greater opportunity to allow for voices

that have previously been unheard (Bylund, 2005) as well as targeting a diverse range of people (Gavin, Rodham & Poyer, 2008). Public discussions on the internet enable the examination of naturalistic data (Jowett, 2015) with threads offering more subjective data, seeking personal opinions (Biyani, Caragea, Singh & Mitra, 2012).

Although, using online forums as a mean of data collection can have its limitations, which will now be discussed further. Previous research has found that parents that are online users, for example Mumsnet users, are aware and conscious of the media's impact upon the principles of motherhood (Pedersen, 2016). This may impact their posts online as users may provide discussions of what they deem to be socially acceptable (Pendry & Salvatore, 2015) or portray a positive image of parenthood, rather than their true, honest experiences (Seale, Charteris-Black, MacFarlane & McPherson, 2010; Wiszniewski & Coyne, 2002). Hence why this study aims to explore both positive and negative orientations.

### **Mumsnet**

The data focused on the website [www.mumsnet.com](http://www.mumsnet.com). Mumsnet is an open, public parenting website where users can gain advice, compare experiences, offer information and start discussions in relation to parenting, but also on a range of topics (Pedersen & Smithson, 2013). Mumsnet was started by a mother who experienced a disastrous family holiday in 2000, to which she wished she had some guidance and advice. From this Mumsnet was set up as a small website where parents could share advice, this rapidly grew. Mumsnet has nearly four million visits per month (Mumsnet, 2011), mostly mothers (Mumsnet census, 2009) who are using the internet and discussion forums to socialise, debate topics, gain advice and share their own knowledge in a more anonymised manner (Lupton, Pedersen, & Thomas, 2016; Rothbaum, Martland & Jannsen, 2008; Madge & O'Connor, 2005).

### **Why Mumsnet?**

The parenting discussion forum on Mumsnet was selected for analysis due to the extensive threads offered, exploring a range of diverse topics in relation to parenting styles, parenting behaviours and parenting debates over the education of their children through a natural exposure, all relevant to the aims of this research. Mumsnet can be viewed as a more natural setting for exploring and observing the recording of certain behaviours, opinions and experiences (Marshall & Rossman, 2010). Therefore, Mumsnet is seen to comply with the qualitative stance adopted by this study due to the nature of qualitative research aiming to explore human behaviour in a specific context (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe, Jackson & Lowe, 2008). Similarly, the qualitative approach used in this study attempts to study parents in a natural setting resulting in making sense of and interpreting their behaviour to make meaning of what is being explored, in this instance a parenting style (Smith, 2015; Banister, 2011).

## **Ethics**

Using Mumsnet as a data source can be seen to contrast with the ethical guidelines as produced by The British Psychological Society (2014). This section will discuss some of these ethical guidelines and how this study will ensure ethics practice. The British Psychological Society (2014) states that anyone involved with research should be aware and give consent. However, the argument is that if a person has posted online within the public domain, their words are accessible to anybody who has access to the Internet (Reid, 2016). There are some who take the view that messages posted to publically accessible forums are in the public domain; therefore, institutional ethical review and gaining consent from the contributors to online forums are unnecessary (Seale, Charteris-Black, MacFarlane & McPherson, 2010; Walther, 2002). Hence, the submission of their comment within the discussion on the forum will be used as informed consent, as the individual is publicly posting their views for anybody to access (Jowett, 2015). Furthermore, the BPS (2013) state the “use of research data without gaining valid consent may be justifiable” (p7). This links to

another reason why Mumsnets was selected, due to the forums being posted in the public domain and being easily accessible (Skea, Entwistle, Watt & Russell, 2008).

### **Data Source**

Although there are not any immediate participants in this study, the database from the server Mumsnet reported some of the demographic data suggesting that the 95% of mothers using this facility share similar characteristics and lifestyles such as, being highly educated, working mothers who have an above-average income (Pedersen et al., 2013; Mumsnet census, 2009; Mackenzie, 2017). This gives some information about the users, but suggests a particular type of user, which lack generalisability (Phillips & Broderick, 2014). Yet a further limitation of this information is that the census was carried out in 2009, suggesting the data is slightly dated.

The parents who are posting as users on the website Mumsnet use a username. However, maximal anonymisation procedures were implemented, such as the removal of any traces of the user's user names. A further step was undertaken of issuing initials to identify individuals when collecting, analysing and reporting the data such as T1D1 – thread one, discussion one (Roberts, 2015; Rodham, McCabe & Blake, 2009). Confidentiality of the posts was maintained, and data recorded in a manner that would not cause personal identification (Warrell & Jacobsen, 2014). Any quotes or material used from the website in the study were searched to make sure it was not traceable to any individual persons (Rodham et al., 2009; Brotsky & Giles, 2007). If the user deleted their comment during analysis, this formed their right to withdraw from the study and their discussion was removed (BPS, 2013).

### **Coding scheme**

To permit a more detailed level of analysis, a procedure based on content analysis was developed (Willig, 2012; Schmidt, Raque-Bogdan, Piontkowski & Schaefer, 2011). After the

source of data collection was decided, the research surrounding pushy parenting was used to create a coding scheme. Although the categories for the coding scheme were primarily defined before the analysis began, the scheme was modified to fit the data throughout the data collection (Liamputtong, 2012). Using a directed approach, drawing upon prior research to identify key concepts (Potter & Levine-Donnerstein, 1999), analysis started with a theory or relevant research findings as a guidance for the initial codes (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Therefore, the literature discussed throughout this study was used to describe the characteristics of pushy parenting, enabling a clear definition of the different behaviours associated with the parenting style. Furthermore, the behaviours related to this parenting style were used when analysing the conversation of threads, identifying whether certain parents display pushy parenting traits.

The following codes that were developed from the literature are displayed in Table 1. This is the coding scheme used when identifying pushy parenting traits from threads. However, when reading the discussions, due to the negativity associated with being a pushy parent codes were also established to identify whether the behaviours displayed were justified by the mother, indicating a reason for the behaviour which links to the code identifying whether the performed behaviour was in the best interest of the child. Coding was also implemented to check for any associations between orientation displayed towards the child and educator. Positive comments were associated with the praise and 'bragging' of children or teachers, whereas negative comments were linked with aggression, frustration and behaviours that displayed blame towards other parties. The coder also categorised the mother's behaviour as positive or negative. Lastly, the gender of the child was also coded as male, female or not specified.

Table 1.  
*Developed Codes*

<b>Code</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
Parents making academic decisions	1 = Yes 2 = No	The literature suggests that pushy parents are too heavily involved in making decisions for their children, especially decisions within an educational context (Beauvais, 2017).
Interfering with extra-curricular activities	1 = Yes 2 = No	Pushy parents have also been found to make decisions for their children on what they wish them to participate in outside of an educational context (Saner, 2015).
Competitiveness	1 = Yes 2 = No	This code refers to the pushy parent displaying competitive tendencies such as showing off their children, competing with other parents and bragging (Halliwell, 2015).
Having high, but developmentally inappropriate expectations	1 = Yes 2 = No	It has been found that pushy parents tend to set unrealistic expectations for their children in comparison with their developmental ability (Rubie-Davies, Peterson, Irving, Widdowson & Dixon, 2010).
Justifiable behaviour	1 = Yes 2 = No	This code explored whether the behaviour displayed by the pushy parent was justified or justifiable in relation to the reasons why it was performed.
Within the best interest of the child	1 = Yes 2 = No	This code aims to identify whether the behaviour performed by the pushy parent is actually in the best interest of the child or whether it is a selfish act.
Orientation towards the child	1 = Positive 2 = Negative 3 = Not mentioned	It was explored whether the pushy parent's language and behaviours displayed online reflected a positive or negative orientation towards their own child.
Orientation towards the educator	1 = Positive 2 = Negative 3 = Not mentioned	As above but investigated orientation towards the child's educator.
View of the mother	1 = Positive 2 = Negative 3 = Not mentioned	This code enabled the researcher to explore whether the mothers actions, language and behaviours were viewed wither positively or negatively within the public domain.

Gender	1 = Male (DS) 2 = Daughter (DD) 3 = Not specified 4 = Male & Female	The gender of the child of the pushy parent was coded, referring to the initials used on Mumsnet: DS – Darling Son DD – Darling Daughter
--------	--	--

With the coding scheme developed, discussion threads were identified on Mumsnet by exploring topics within the Education and Parenting categories. Nine threads were decided upon, five were selected from the search Education – Gifted and Talented and three from the search Education – Extra-curricular activities and a further thread from the search under Being a parent – Parenting. Details of where the data was obtained can be found in Table 2.

Table 2.

*Information about the sources of data collection*

<b>Search</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Theme</b>	<b>Number of discussions</b>
Gifted and Talented	July-August 2017	KS1 SAT results	Nine discussion posts
Gifted and Talented	September 2015	Do I need to do anything?	Twelve discussion posts
Gifted and Talented	February 2014	School not academically challenging	Fourteen discussion posts
Gifted and Talented	September 2014	To be disappointed that my child is not clever?	Thirteen discussion posts
Gifted and Talented	May 2013	If your child is very good at maths, when/how was it spotted at school?	Twenty discussion posts
Extra-curricular activities	March 2017	Music teachers	Six discussion posts
Extra-curricular activities	June 2010	Competitive and non-competitive sports day	Nine discussion posts



Extra-curricular activities	September 2015	After school clubs	Ten discussion posts
Being a parent – Parenting	January 2012	Pushy parenting	Seven discussion posts

These nine threads with one hundred discussions in total were chosen as the parents were discussing topics naturally, whilst displaying pushy parenting traits. These discussions were copied into Microsoft Word documents where any traceable information was removed including usernames and were replaced with initials.

The coder then went through the discussions and determined whether each category, using the coding scheme, was present within the particular discussion, simply by highlighting evidence of the behavioural trait against the raw data with a guided key (see Table 2).

Table 3.  
*Example of how codes emerged from the data*

Discussion	Content	Key	Notes
T1D1	Okay I know this is a smug post but I can't exactly go round telling all and sundry in real life so the internet is getting it.	Male Female Academic achievements Extra-curricular activities Competitiveness High expectations Positive child Negative child Positive educator Negative educator Positive Mother Negative Mother Best interest Justifiable behaviour	Mother can be viewed negatively for 'showing off' sons academic achievements, but the use of the words 'smug', 'proud' can represent a sense of pride, viewing her positively.
	DS's SAT results are really good, I mean he was predicted to exceed expected standards or whatever the correct terminology is, but I did expect him to get nearly everything right.		
	Maths 115 SPAG 115 Reading 113		It is a justifiable behaviour as she is proud of her son but don't think it's in the best interest as he cannot view this online which reiterates the 'showing off' aspect.
	Thanks for listening, as you were 🙏 . very-very proud mum		

From this a table was created with the data and a corresponding yes or no in relation the code being evident within the post (see Table 3). This was also performed when

identifying the gender of the child and whether there was any positive or negative orientation displayed towards either the child or the educator (see Table 4). This method infers that each unit of analysis could have received more than one code, suggesting there was evidence of more than one behavioural trait.

Table 4.  
*Example of how data was recorded once coded*

<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Making academic decisions</b>	<b>Interfering with extra-curricular activities</b>	<b>Competitiveness</b>	<b>Having high expectations</b>	<b>In the child's best interest</b>	<b>Justifiable behaviour</b>
T1D1	Yes		Yes	Yes		

Table 4.  
*Example of how data was recorded once coded*

<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Negative Child</b>	<b>Positive Child</b>	<b>Negative Educator</b>	<b>Positive Educator</b>	<b>Negative Mother</b>	<b>Positive Mother</b>
T1D1	DS		Yes		Yes		

## Data Analysis

Content analysis is a research method used when studying a form of media to gain an insight and measure the display of a concept or particular words in order to interpret, make meaning and form relationships between the messages portrayed in relation to a specific construct (Giles, 2016; Banister, 2011; Hollway & Jefferson, 2013). This form of analysis was appropriate for this study as the main aim was to find out whether parents in the UK are seen to display pushy parenting behaviours and whether this is associated with a negative or positive orientation towards the educator and the child. Although, the richness of the data can be lost when applying content analytical approaches if the categories for the codes are not effective, relevant or appropriate, which could result in inaccurate findings (Neuman, 2014; Vogt, Gardner & Haeffele, 2012). Similarly, previous research using content analysis has found this method is subject to increased error and therefore may require more than one coder

to carry out analysis (Brutsa, Gill & Duniewicz, 2010; Smith, Smith, Osborn & Samara, 2008; Knowles & Wilkinson, 2017). In relation to these recommendations, one researcher coded the data whilst a second reviewed and compared the findings to ensure consistency.

To test the study's hypotheses, data was input into SPSS as a contingency table and 2x2 chi-square tests were used to assess whether there were associations between pairs of variables. Chi-square tests use nominal data such as categories to explore whether the variables differ, by counting how many observations fall in each category and comparing the categorical responses between groups (Kilic, 2016), this captures the greatness of the discrepancy between expected and observed values (Hinton, McMurray & Brownlow, 2014). Chi-square test is an inferential statistical test which provides a p-value or significance value which determines whether you can reject the null hypothesis (Pandis, 2016). To conclude that the variables are not independent of each other and that there is a statistical relationship between the categorical variables, the p-value should be less than .05 (Spiegel & Stephens, 2008; Wagner, 2010; Stephens, 2006). This criteria was applied when concluding whether there was a significant relationship between the categorical variables.

However, chi-square tests are sensitive to small and large sample sizes, if the sample size is relatively small, strong associations may not appear as significant due to not be substantive enough (Greene & D'Oliveira, 2005; Ravid, 2010). A chi-square test is also impacted by the distribution within the cells, it is sensitive to data where the expected value in each cell is fewer than 5, if 20% of the variables are more than 5 there is an alternative test known as Fisher's exact test (Howitt & Cramer, 2000; Dytham, 2011).

The results of the chi-square and the findings of the content analysis will now be presented within the findings and discussion section.

### **Ethical approval**

The study received ethical approval from the Department of Psychology Ethics Committee at the University of Chester (see Appendix C).

## **Findings and Discussion**

2x2 chi-square tests were used to test the four hypotheses. In total, one hundred discussions taken from nine threads on Mumsnet were used. In each case, the data were categorised and the chi-square allowed the association between the variables to be tested. This section will firstly present the main findings from the chi-square tests in association with the hypotheses made and will draw upon existing literature followed by a deeper analysis of the content used within the discussions, lastly followed by any other relevant findings.

### **Hypothesis 1**

Hypothesis 1 states that ‘there will be an association between pushy parenting behaviour and whether the child is a girl or a boy, with more pushy parenting behaviours being shown towards girls than boys’. This hypothesis was made based on the surrounding literature stating that girls perform better academically than boys (Fischer et al., 2013; Ellis et al., 2008). Similarly, it has been found that mothers put more pressure on their daughters which enables them to outperform boys (Minello & Blossfeld, 2017). Although there has been no association directly found between pushy parenting and the gender of the child in other research, research within other fields suggests that girls perform better, therefore, this might influence pushy parents to display their behaviour towards their daughters within an academic, educational context.

However, within the findings of the current study exploring pushy parenting behaviours within an educational setting, 67.7% of the discussions analysed involved mothers displaying pushy behaviours towards their sons. This was looking overall at whether any of the four coded pushy parenting behaviours were evident and not each behaviour individually. This finding contrasts the hypothesis made as it suggests that more pushy parent behaviours (all four behaviours combined) are displayed towards males than females. However, although

girls tend to perform better academically (Fischer et al., 2013; Ellis et al., 2008), it is important to note that this does not account for intelligence and rather just performance (Halpern, 2000). This finding suggests that there is no distinct difference between intelligence and gender, but rather girls perform better within school in areas such as examinations. This can be related back to Chomsky's (1965) competence vs performance theory, the child may have the ability to complete something successfully, but their performance may be impacted by memory, distractions, motivation, interest or errors. Yet, research still suggests that parents show greater involvement with their daughter's education over their sons (Carter & Wojtkiewicz, 2000).

The chi-square tests ran were 2x2 and therefore each of the four coded pushy parenting behaviours were analysed against gender, providing four different chi-square results. This enabled a deeper, more specific insight into which pushy parenting behaviours were associated with being displayed by the parent in relation to the gender of their child. The results are as followed:

Table 5.  
*Gender \* Mothers making academic decisions*

Gender of Child		Mothers making academic decisions		Total
		Yes	No	
Male (DS)	Count	52	16	68
	Expected Count	46.0	22.0	68.0
Female (DD)	Count	15	16	31
	Expected Count	21.0	10.0	31.0
Total	Count	67	32	99
	Expected Count	67.0	32.0	99.0

As displayed in Table 5, of the ninety-nine discussions analysed, significantly more mothers (52) displayed the behavioural trait of making academic decisions for their children when their child was male,  $X^2 = 7.677$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p = .006$ . Because the  $p$ -value is lower than the

alpha of 0.05, this result is statistically significant. The  $p$ -value indicates that these variables are not independent of each other and that there is a statistically significant relationship between the gender of the child and the pushy parenting behaviour of making academic decisions.

Instances where the parent was involved in making academic decisions, more frequently for their sons, occurred when they felt that the educator was not challenging their child enough, not meeting their needs and not allowing their children to excel. Although, questions arose as to whether the child's needs are not being met by the education system or the parent is being too pushy. Some research suggests that children within the education system are overlooked, ignored and not stretched (Gerver, 2010), due to demands, standards and the expectations set for our educational system (Gallant, 2009; Reback, Rockoff & Schwartz, 2014). Equally parents can be too heavily involved and interfere, causing tension and conflict between the educator, the parent and the child (Lasater, 2016).

Interestingly most of the boy's mothers were discussing and pushing their sons within mathematical work, which more males have been seen to enter the fields of maths and science (Preckel, Goetz, Pekrun, & Kleine, 2008; Jacobs & Bleeker, 2004). This is seen to be a gender stereotype which is still evident today (Martinot & Désert, 2007). Although research has suggested that gender difference in mathematical achievement is on the decrease (Else-Quest, Hyde & Linn, 2010; Lindberg, Hyde, Petersen & Linn, 2010), the gender difference of boys achieving more consistently in mathematics is still occurring (Carmichael, MacDonald, & McFarland-Piazza, 2014; Weis, Heikamp, & Trommsdorff, 2013). Females are still lacking self-confidence within their mathematical ability (Else-Quest, Mineo & Higgins, 2013) and displaying higher levels of mathematics anxiety (Devine, Fawcett, Szűcs & Dowker, 2012), with parents and teachers encouraging early mathematical experiences more with boys than girls (Caplan & Caplan, 2005; Simpkins, Davis-Kean, & Eccles, 2005). This could be a

reason why pushy parents are taking more of a shine to making academic decisions for their sons, as they are aware that females underestimate their achievements (Lloyd, Walsh & Yailagh, 2005), they are still holding the stereotypical view of mathematics as a boys' subject (Hargreaves, Homer & Swinnerton, 2008) and are aware that boys are perceived to be higher achievers in mathematics (Geist & King, 2008).

Within some of the discussions analysed when exploring parents making academic decisions for their children, some parents seemed to dismiss the educator not challenging their children in English with comments such as “I would like Ds to be stretched with more challenging work, which will energise him. He is reading gold / stage 9 but doesn't find them very interesting. Luckily we have a very good children's library and a good collection at home so I'm not worried on that part”. This reinforces the discussions centring a push for more mathematical progression with boys, despite research suggesting that boys are still underachieving in literacy in comparison to girls (Skelton & Francis, 2011; Lingard, Martino, & Mills, 2009). Although, in the quote above, the mother seems to take it into her own hands to equip her son with suitable reading materials and dismisses any worries and concerns to discuss with the teacher.

Another finding when analysing the data suggests that parents seem to be pushing their sons down the route of mathematical challenges such as extra work at home with tutors and mention of early GCSEs, A levels and universities. Parents who have a higher educational level (Ireson & Rushforth, 2011), value educational achievements and have stronger views of self-regulation believe it is in their role as a parent to provide a private tutor for their child (Ireson & Rushforth, 2014). This supports a pushy parent employing a private tutor as pushy parents tend to be of a higher socio-economic class (Archer, 2010; Beauvais, 2017) and have high educational values, expectations and want their children to achieve (Cigman, 2006). In relation to parents pushing their children to sit early examinations, parents



are having greater expectations of their children, which can be related to their own time pressure due to economic, technological and cultural changes within society (Garhammer, 2002, Rosa, 2003; Southerton & Tomlinson, 2005), parents have pressure to ensure their children are academically stable. Although, this can cause a protentional stressor in children's life which can lead to mental health illnesses (Gunnarsdottir, Bjereld, Hensing, Petzold & Povlsen, 2015).

“I asked for extra maths for our DS, school were not supportive, we ended up getting a maths tutor (who is completely amazing) as a treat”

“I agree about early GCSE, but only because being good at maths surely leads into A level, which in turn leads into university. This is what I want for my son”.

Key words used throughout the discussions surrounding pushy parents and their son's mathematical achievements and in the examples above are the word 'I', these parents are influencing, pressuring and decreasing their children's autonomy by making selfish decisions (Deci and Ryan, 2008). These parents are making the decisions for their children based on what they want, but what does the child want? Pushy parents cannot find the balance and develop their parenting personality that is in harmony with their child and their own autonomy (Levine, 2003).

One parent refers to a tutor as a 'treat' for her son. This suggests that the parent is dedicated to her son learning and rewards him with learning related activities, which can either motivate the child or lead to psychological issues such as resentment and mental health problems if he does not wish to participate in these activities (Schaefer, 1965; Grolnick, 2003). This way of parenting also contrasts with the self-determination theory which indicates that children play an active role in their own development, and parents need to trust children to develop naturally and at their own pace (Joussemet, Landry & Koestner, 2008).

Therefore, parent involving themselves and making these decisions without the child's approval just to progress their learning ahead of what should be happening naturally can cause anxiety (Wijsbroek, Hale, Raaijmakers & Meeus, 2011) and internalizing and aggressive behaviours (Albrecht, Galambos & Jansson, 2007). However, it is important to recognise that some children may enjoy and see a tutor as a treat or strive to sit their exams early, but this study is based upon literature identifying a pushy parent.

Table 6.  
*Gender \* Mothers interfering with extra-curricular activities*

<b>Gender of Child</b>		<b>Mothers interfering with extra-curricular activities</b>		<b>Total</b>
		Yes	No	
Male (DS)	Count	25	43	68
	Expected Count	30.9	37.1	68.0
Female (DD)	Count	20	11	31
	Expected Count	14.1	16.9	31.0
Total	Count	45	54	99
	Expected Count	45.0	54.0	99.0

However, in contrast with the findings reported in Table 5, when exploring the relationships between the gender of the child and whether mothers interfere with extra-curricular activities, the chi-square  $X^2 = 6.614$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p = .010$ , indicates a significant relationship, suggesting that parents interfere with extra-curricular activities of girls but not of boys (see Table 6). Again, this seemed to contradict with some of the existing literature which suggests that boys are more heavily involved and encouraged in extra-curricular activities such as competitive sport (Van Deventer et al., 2013; Niederle et al., 2007) and parents tend to show more of a competitive nature within extracurricular activities if their child is male (Kane, 2012; Gurian et al., 2000).

Although, it has been found that girls are not as active as boys or motivated to participate in extra activities (Riddoch, Mattocks, Deere, Saunders, Kirkby, Tilling & Ness, 2007; Nader, Bradley, Houts, McRitchie & O'Brien, 2008). Girls are more likely to be

influenced by their mothers, and their mothers' expectations are particularly strong predictors of their obedience (Attanasio & Kaufmann, 2014). Girls emotional traits allow them to be more sensitive towards hurting people's feelings (Kenny, Dooley & Fitzgerald, 2013). This may explain why pushy parents are able to make decisions about extra-curricular activities more for their daughters than their sons. However, the activities girls do tend to participate in tend to be either the performing arts (Jago, Davis, McNeill, Sebire, Haase, Powell & Cooper, 2011) or music (Hallam, Rogers & Creech, 2002). This was evident within the discussions analysed which suggested girls being pushed to partake in drama, dance, languages, swimming and playing a musical instrument. There were few discussions of the pushy parent encouraging sporting activities for their daughter. This may be down to social influences and perceived societal norms (Whitehead & Biddle, 2008).

“my oldest for example **we’ve** pushed her to be a keen musician who's also learnt languages at home. **We** are planning to add German to her list this year because she can't do it at school”

“**I** always wanted to play an instrument as a child so encouraged her to do so”

“she's just learnt to play my life goal of the violin”

“She spends her time out of school doing sports, drama, dancing, swimming and social activities and **I want** her to start an instrument”

“**I’ve** always pushed her to attend clubs”

The quotes as stated above display the needs of the pushy parent again with words like ‘we’ve pushed’, ‘I always wanted’, ‘I want’. This again seems to conflict with the self-determination theory as these children are not free to make their own decisions, the pushy parent is depriving them of being autonomous, the child is not motivated to participate in these activities as they are forced and have no choice (Deci & Ryan, 2008). However,

Simoncini & Caltabiono (2012) found that children benefit from participating in two or more activities for 80-90 minutes per week, increasing self-esteem and lowering rates of depression (Barber, Eccles & Stone, 2001; Mahoney, Schweder & Stattin, 2002). Although parents play a role in extra-curricular activities by encouraging, suggesting and allowing the participation (Fredricks, Hackett & Bregman, 2010), forceful behaviours from parents may impact a child's psychological well-being, by decreasing autonomy, personal growth and self-acceptance (Uji, Sakamoto, Adachi & Kitamura, 2014).

The other two coded pushy parenting behaviours were not deemed significant when associated with gender. The chi-square tests result for whether the mother showed a competitive nature and there being a relationship with the gender of the child was  $X^2 = .775$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p = .379$  and the mother having high, but developmentally inappropriate expectations and there being an association with the gender of the child was reported as  $X^2 = .1.091$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p = .296$ . These tests did not prove to be significant due to the p-value being greater than .05.

### **Hypotheses 2 and 3**

Hypotheses 2 and 3 aimed to explore the orientation displayed from the pushy parent towards their child and the educator. It was predicted that there will be an association between pushy parenting behaviour and positive comments/orientation towards the child, with more behaviour being associated with positive comments about the child and that there will be an association between pushy parenting behaviour and negative comments/orientation towards the educator, with more behaviour being associated with negative comments about the educator) These hypotheses were made from the literature which suggests that pushy parents favour and speak positively of their children, showing them off to other people (Sutherland, 2012; Knass, 2013) and rather blame the educator for why their child is not

meeting their high expectations, displaying negative behaviours (Denholm, 2016; Archer, 2010).

Table 7.  
*Orientation displayed from the Mother towards child and educator*

<b>Positive or Negative towards Child</b>		<b>Positive or Negative towards Educator</b>		<b>Total</b>
		Positive	Negative	
Positive	Count	11	64	75
	Expected Count	18.0	57.0	75.0
Negative	Count	12	9	21
	Expected Count	5.0	16.0	21.0
Total	Count	23	73	96
	Expected Count	23.0	73.0	96.0

The  $p$ -value from the chi-square test  $X^2 = 16.248$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p = .000$ , indicates that these variables are not independent of each other and that there is a statistically significant relationship between the orientation displayed from the parent towards the child and towards the educator (see Table 7). This finding suggests that there were more positive comments presented towards the pushy parent's child and more negative comments directed towards the child's educator, which supports the hypotheses made.

Firstly, it has been found that parents tend to be biased towards their child, and always see them in a positive manner and therefore any failure reconciles with excuses and blame elsewhere (Rytkönen, Aunola, and Nurmi, 2007). Parents and children have been found to solely hold teachers responsible for student learning and success (Venkatesan, 2011), associating any failure with lack of effort. However, due to effort being controllable parents and students have been seen to apply a self-protection mechanism of deferring attention from their own lack of effort to blaming other people (Peterson, Rubie-Davies, Elley-Brown, Widdowson, Dixon & Irving, 2011). This blame, self-protection and negativity between families and educators can cause tensions resulting in stress and anxiety for teachers, parents and students (Ludicke & Kortman, 2012). This involvement, blame and exposure to tension can

also encourage children to grow up not learning how to solve their own problems or accept failure, lacking competence (Lasater, 2016). Teachers can feel unmotivated, unworthy and suffer from mental health illnesses if they feel always at blame (Monducci, Battaglia, Forte, Masillo, Telesforo, Carlotto, & Fiori Nastro, 2016). Yet pushy parents feel it is their responsibility to ensure their high standards and expectations for their children are being met (Stone, 2010; Sullivan, 2013), which can be seen as being in the child's best interest. However, how the parent goes about it and where the child is involved decides whether it actually is in the child's best interest.

Linking to the points above in relation to the self-protection mechanism, traits of this were evident in the discussions when exploring the orientation displayed towards the child and the educator.

'My DS isn't being challenged by his school and his teachers are rubbish! I've complained numerous time and nothing has happened. He is very bright and able and I've had to take his future into my hands'

'Children with talents should be shown off like my ds, I always brag about his gifts as the school don't recognise them!'

'My school is awful so I hired a tutor for my child and he is now excelling and way above other children'

The parents mainly speak positively about their children's academic ability but the language used indicates that their children are able and they are pushing them to be above the rest such as '**now excelling and way above other children**'. Although, teachers can have 30 children in their class which they aim to get the children where they are supposed to be in line with the expectations of the Government. Therefore, teachers can be seen to only be doing their jobs. The use of words such as 'awful' and 'rubbish', do not give insight into why the

educator or school is to blame, this might be because there are no justifiable reasons. In order to achieve academic success, each stakeholder plays a role, the child, the parent and the teacher (Venkatesan, 2011). However, it seems that the pushy parent will not admit that themselves or their child are factors involved with achieving academically and find it easier to blame a professional (Rytönen, Aunola & Nurmi, 2005). But, pushy parents like to feel in control and strive for flawlessness known as perfectionism, (Stoeber et al., 2006; Snell et al., 2005) and one way of doing so might be by blaming the educator rather than joining forces and working as a unit to ensure the best for the child.

Interestingly this can also be linked to a chi-square test that was performed, exploring whether the mother was perceived positively or negatively and the orientation she displayed towards the educator.  $X^2 = 5.461$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p = .019$ , the chi-square test results indicate that if the mother was viewed negatively within her discussion she showed a negative orientation towards the educator. This was categorised as the mother displaying negative behaviours and using adverse language towards people such as the educator for unnecessary or unjustifiable reasons. ‘DS is naturally good at maths (but he doesn't sound as talented as some on here). His preschool noticed and asked me if I knew, they told school. He is in year 1 now and in the top set but given nothing extra’. The mother is portrayed negatively as she has inappropriate expectations for her 5-year-old who is already recognised by the school and placed in a top set where the input should be paced at his level. She is showing negativity towards the teacher by stating ‘nothing extra’, as if she expects the teacher to be doing extra work for her son, whilst not allowing him to be a 5-year-old.

However, it can be argued that the parent is just wanting what is best for their child and it seems these parents are wanting their children to be challenged further, they do not want their children to start resenting school due to boredom or lack of motivation. ‘I experienced great difficulties with some of my son's primary school teachers not wanting to

engage with our concerns about his ability and the reasons why he was becoming more and more unwilling to go to school where he was bored.’ In this part of the discussion the pushy parent seems to have the child’s best interest by justifying her negative feelings towards her son’s education. In instances like these the pushy parent may have the right to display a negative orientation to educators who are not supportive in changing the child’s education due to justifiable reasons.

### Other significant findings surrounding orientations

Although hypotheses were not made, the researcher felt it was important to explore the four behavioural traits of a pushy parent and whether there is any relationship between the orientation displayed towards the child or the educator to gain a deeper insight into which behavioural trait encloses more positivity or negativity towards the child or the educator. Two tests were deemed significant and can be related to the findings of hypotheses 2 and 3 stating that more pushy parents will show a negative orientation towards the educator whilst showing a positive orientation towards their child.

Table 8.  
*Competitiveness \* Orientation shown towards child from parent*

Competitive Parent		Positive or Negative towards Child		Total
		Positive	Negative	
Yes	Count	43	5	48
	Expected Count	38.8	9.7	48.0
No	Count	36	15	51
	Expected Count	40.7	10.3	51.0
Total	Count	79	20	99
	Expected Count	79.0	20.0	99.0

The p-value of the chi-square results  $X^2 = 5.534$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p = .019$  indicates a statistically significant relationship between the pushy parenting displaying competitive behaviours and demonstrating a more positive orientation towards their child (see Table 8). These codes complement each other as the parents presenting competitive behaviours were



seen to be comparing their children, competing with other parents and showing off their children which reflected as them displaying positive comments about their children.

It has been suggested that mothers tend to compete with each other in relation to their child's physical and cognitive development and their knowledge of parenting (Higginson, 1998). Pushy parents who are seen to be competitive, praise and speak positively of their children in order to compare them to other children, ensuring their child is the best (Bigner & Gerhardt, 2014; Bicknell, 2014). Yet, these parents can be seen to place pressure on their children to deliver and support their expectations of their child (Hughes & Read, 2012). Similarly, this competitive nature pushy parents are displaying can cause pressure and anxiety for other parents and children, enhancing a deeper competitive cycle (Bois, Lalanne, & Delforge, 2009). Some parents use language to make their family seem 'perfect' when their words are not a true or realistic representation, hence causing pressure and stress for the child to live up to (Miller, 2010).

Many of the discussions analysed displayed evidence of stressful environments for children but disguised it by using positive language. 'DD was finally spotted at year 2 after constant nagging. However, I'm inclined to think it's because I was a maths teacher and DH a scientist so we are a numerate household. I do think she's particularly gifted, but also lucky in her surroundings.' Here the parent is competing with other parents indirectly by telling everyone her and her husband's roles and speaking positively of her child by using the word 'gifted'. However, the parent also appears to include a slight dig at other parents stating, 'but also lucky in her surrounding', indicating that the family are influential and supportive, but this also put immense pressure on the child to become involved in numbers like her parents.

However, other parents made their competitive natures more apparent by referring to it as a 'smug post'. 'Okay I know this is a smug post but I can't exactly go around telling all

and sundry in real life so the internet is getting it. DS's SAT results are really good, I mean he was predicted to exceed expected standards or whatever the correct terminology is, but I did expect him to get nearly everything right. Maths 115, SPAG 115, Reading 113. Thanks for listening, as you were 😊. Very, very proud mum.' In the discussion as stated here, the mother has recognised her behaviour, displayed a competitive nature by bragging about and showing off her son, whilst speaking positively about him saying she is 'very, very proud', really emphasising the pride by repeating the word 'very' and stating that his results are 'really good'. Although this might encourage and motivate the child to continue to do his best as the mother uses positive language, but she still did expect him to do this which captures the pressuring trait of competitiveness.

Table 9.

*High expectations \* Orientation shown towards educator from parent*

High expectations		Positive or Negative towards Educator		Total
		Positive	Negative	
Yes	Count	5	46	51
	Expected Count	8.9	42.1	51.0
No	Count	12	34	46
	Expected Count	8.1	37.9	46.0
Total	Count	17	80	97
	Expected Count	17.0	80.0	97.0

Similarly, there was a relationship between parents having high expectations for their children and displaying a negative orientation towards their child's educator (see Table 9).

The  $p$ -value  $X^2 = 4.436$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p = .035$  indicates that these variables are not independent of each other and there is a relationship.

Most parents have high expectations for their children in order for them to succeed and have a good life (Smith & Smith, 1997; Knass, 2013). Mothers of higher levels of educational achievement, like Mumsnet users (Mumsnet census, 2009; Mackenzie, 2017) reportedly set higher expectations for their children and greater aspirations for their children

especially for self-actualization (Reese, Peterson, Waldie, Schmidt, Bandara, Carr & Morton, 2016). Although the expectation of the pushy parent can be developmentally inappropriate (Chambers, 2006), relaying a negative orientation to the teacher when the expectation is not suitable for the child and instead is wanted by the parent (McEntire, 2009). Parents who have these high expectations that don't match their children's aspirations result in their children having lower well-being (Rutherford, 2015).

Parents find it easier to blame the teacher as to why the child has not met their developmentally inappropriate expectations (Denholm, 2016), parents can be blinded by their biases towards their child and protect themselves and their child by diverting the blame (Peterson et al., 2011). Educators are seen as the easiest to blame as they also have expectations for the children they are teaching and they are seen to be experts within education and professionals (Venkatesan, 2011). Yet some teacher can have low expectations (Rubie-Davies, 2007) and higher expectations for students who they deemed as self-confident and a positive nature (Timmermans, de Boer & van der Werf, Margaretha, 2016), hence the need for parent's involvement and the negativity directed towards the educator.

‘DD1 is in Yr1 and very bright, she finds all the work at school easy but she apparently gets everything right, produces very good work and is very engaged in the classroom as well as helpful and so on. She spends her time out of school doing sports, drama, dancing, swimming and social activities and I want her to start an instrument. I don't want her to get too comfortable coasting, If she loose interest in her education how will she go to university and establish a career?’

‘Some parents want what is best for their child. I want my DS to be challenged academically, take part in as many sports as possible, go to university, have a good job. Why shouldn't we do this for our children?’

Obviously, as seen in the discussions above, parents are going to be disappointed and display negativity towards educators if they are talking about university with their child in Year 1, this is not a developmentally appropriate expectation for a 5-year-old (Hiltz, 2015). The parents have aspirations for their children but are discussing and implementing them too early, not allowing the child to enjoy childhood and causing conflict with the educator. This appears to be a vicious cycle.

### Hypotheses 4 and 5

Hypotheses 4 and 5 encapsulate whether the behaviour performed by the mother is in the best interest of the child and whether the reasons given made the behaviour justifiable. It was assumed that the parent displaying the behaviour will not have the child's best interest at heart when displaying certain behaviours and will instead present selfish tendencies. But, the pushy parent will provide justification for their behaviour due to their high expectations to achieve of both the child and the educator. However, the justification may not be in the child's best interest and rather meet the needs of the parent.

Table 10.

*Is the behaviour in the child's best interest and is it justifiable?*

Is it in the child's best interest?		Did the reasons given make the behaviour justifiable?		Total
		Yes	No	
Yes	Count	59	6	65
	Expected Count	50.7	14.3	65.0
No	Count	19	16	35
	Expected Count	27.3	7.7	35.0
Total	Count	78	22	100
	Expected Count	78.0	22.0	100.0

This chi-square test  $X^2 = 17.646$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p = .000$ , displays a great significant finding as to when a pushy parenting behaviour is considered in the child's best interests the reasons given made the behaviour justifiable. Although, the discussions were interesting when

analysing and coding as many displayed traits of pushy parenting which seemed to be justifiable by the parents, enhancing the feeling of it being in the child's best interest.

Findings seem to contrast with previous research suggesting that pushy parenting behaviours do not tend to be in the child's best interest (Segrin, Givertz, Swaitkowski & Montgomery, 2015; Freeman, 1991), most of the discussion as to why parents are getting involved in due to not being challenged which is resulting in boredom or lack of motivation. For example, 'Another in agreement here - my DD's state school does this and yet they don't think twice about singling out the most talented children in other realms - music, art, drama who then get chosen for every prize and other children don't get a look-in. Seems totally inconsistent that children aren't allowed to excel at sports! My dd is excellent at sport and I want to show her off as she isn't very academic'. This parent clearly has the child's best interest at heart as she identifies her daughter as not being very academic and the fact that the school does not provide a competitive sports day does not allow her to do well in something she's good at, this reason is justifiable. Yet, the parent is still showing pushy parenting traits by showing a competitive nature of wanting her child to win and be the best at sports.

Similarly, discussions include traits of pushy parenting which are made justifiable and reflect as being in the child's best interest due to there being a lack of challenging work in school and the child becoming unmotivated. 'Tell him what you expect of him and reward him for this. This works well with my DS. I make him more academic and motivate him to learn as the school doesn't challenge him. this will help him in years to come'. In this discussion, the parent is concerned about her son becoming unmotivated to learn, which is in the child's best interest as lack of motivation can cause a decrease in their self-efficacy (Bong, 2008). Therefore, she tries to motivate him to learn outside of school and rewards him for meeting expectations and this reason appears to be justifiable with her son's best interest at heart.

On the other hand, there was evidence within the discussions of instances where the parent recognised their pushy parenting behaviour as not being in the child's best interest and altered this in order to meet the child's needs. 'I think the more important issue here is whether your daughter is enjoying playing the clarinet, or whether she is doing it because you want her to? I only ask this, as I fell into the 'I played a musical instrument, so my children will too' trap. DS1 loved it, was naturally talented, and has progressed to Grade 8 with ease and plays in numerous bands/ groups etc. DS2 hated his first instrument, so we swapped to another. Hated that, so we swapped teacher. He was making painfully slow progress and eventually I just said to the teacher 'I think this is a waste of time and he doesn't even enjoy it'. Huge sigh of relief all round'. In this discussion, the parent was forcing the child to play a musical instrument as she played one. The first son enjoyed the instrument, was good at it and wanted to carry on. Yet the second son disliked playing an instrument. At the time, the mother did not have her second son's best interest and her reason for forcing him was not justifiable. However, she soon recognised that he did not enjoy it and listened to her children, making her put her child's best interest before her own selfish tendencies and stopped him playing a musical instrument. The reasons provided for this were justified.

### **Other significant findings**

Although initial hypotheses were not made, another category emerged when analysing the data. Alongside distinguished codes exploring whether the behaviour is justifiable and within the best interest of the child, the researcher felt it was important to explore whether the mother was viewed positively or negatively in relation to whether the behaviour was seen to be justifiable and within the best interest of the child. Most pushy parents are viewed negatively (Sullivan, 2013; Morawska & Sanders, 2009), yet an exploration is needed whether this orientation shifts if the behaviour is deemed to be beneficial for the child.

Hence, the hypotheses was formed that the mother would be views positively if their behaviour was seen to be justifiable and within the best interest of the child.

Table 11.

*Childs best interest \* Mother being perceived positively or negatively*

<b>Childs best interest</b>		<b>Positive or Negative towards Mother</b>		<b>Total</b>
		Positive	Negative	
Yes	Count	33	32	65
	Expected Count	23.4	41.6	65.0
No	Count	3	32	35
	Expected Count	12.6	22.4	35.0
Total	Count	36	64	100
	Expected Count	36.0	64.0	100.0

Another statistically significant finding when running some extra chi-square tests was the relationship between the behaviour of the pushy parent being performed within the child's best interest and whether the mother is perceived positively or negatively. The chi-square test  $X^2 = 17.582$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p = .000$  shows that when a parent's behaviour is perceived as being in the child's best interests, the mother is perceived positively with the p-value being less than .05.

Pushy parents being viewed positively seems to contrast with what the research suggests (Deci and Ryan, 2008; Sheriff, 2013), yet when the pushy parent behaviour is seen to be in the child's best interest they are views positively, makes sense really. However, pushy parenting behaviours can be seen to be undermining, impact autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 2000) and hold a great sense of pressure and expectation (Cigman, 2006), still, when analysing the data, most of the behaviours seemed to be within the best interest of the child. Most parents are seen to have a deeper connection with their child and understand their needs on a deeper level (Alstott, 2004), hence pushy parents might only be supporting and encouraging their children in a more demanding way as they understand the deep needs of

their children on a more personal level. This was the feel of the data that was collected for this study. Although, it is important to note that there was not much of a difference between the mothers who were portrayed positively and negatively and whether the behaviour is the best interest of the child (see Table 11). Yet, even if the mother was viewed negatively, she still performed the behaviour within the best interest of the child. Most of the pushy parents in this study seemed to justify and make portray their pushy parenting behaviour in a positive way by ensuring it was in the best interest of the child. This seems to contradict the principle of a pushy parent which is displayed as a forceful and self-centred parenting style (Sullivan, 2013; Morawska & Sanders, 2009) where a parent is unsuitably and inappropriately invested within their child (Beauvais, 2017). The behaviours seem to be more justified, reasonable, positive and most importantly within the best interest of the child.

For example, here is one of the discussion taken from Mumsnet: ‘**Thing is, this new sats aren't really helping highly able children to show their true ability, imo. It's a same test for everybody, and don't go beyond what is expected. So if two child scored perfect score, one can be just an above average child, and other can be totally exceptional, but cannot show their true colours. This isnt fair for my ds who can do better than this. But of course I would expect the teacher to determine the difference and hopefully stretch them accordingly.**’

Within this discussion the parents can be seen to be wanting to raise her child’s self-esteem and receive the support, challenge and recognition he needs. She is supportive of the teacher and speaks certainly of her child, and is therefore portrayed positively. She wants the SATs to represent her sons ability which is in his own best interest to ensure the educational input is pitched to his level to maintain motivation and an interest in school. Research suggests that children need a stimulating experience, challenges, difficulty, satisfaction, interaction and frustration in order to motivate them (Campbell & Jane, 2012). This seems to be what this parent is pushing for.



Yet, even if the mother is being presented negatively like in this discussion ‘**Push for loads of clubs and music to get him out of his shell, otherwise they will fall into the background, especially at school. My child benefited from this**’, the mother is pushing and setting developmentally inappropriate expectations as well as talking negatively about the school. However, she performed this behaviour within the best interest of the child as it states that her child has benefitted from her parenting and interfering with aspects of her child’s life.

Within research pushy parenting may be seen as a floating label which has negative connotations, hiding some of the positive characterisations of the parenting style (Beauvais, 2017). Maybe the parenting style has been misinterpreted and although it is recognised as a forceful and self-centred parenting style (Sullivan, 2013), more parents are adopting this style to ensure the best for their children. Pushy parenting styles may be changing and becoming a more familiar, justified parenting style with positive outcomes being more recognised.

Table 12.

*Justified behaviour \* Mother being perceived positively or negatively*

Is the behaviour justifiable?		Positive or Negative towards Mother		Total
		Positive	Negative	
Yes	Count	34	44	78
	Expected Count	28.1	49.9	78.0
No	Count	2	20	22
	Expected Count	7.9	14.1	22.0
Total	Count	36	64	100
	Expected Count	36.0	64.0	100.0

However, the chi-square results  $\chi^2 = 8.864$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p = .003$  indicates that there is also a significant relationship between whether the behaviour performed by the parent has been justified and whether the mother is perceived positively or negatively. In this instance, the mothers who justified their behaviours were also perceived negatively (see Table 12).

Although this relationship seems to support the literature of pushy parents being viewed negatively (Deci and Ryan, 2008; Sheriff, 2013), it was found that the parents behaviours were still justifiable. Within the context pushy parents were explored, they were perceived negatively if they displayed a negative orientation towards other people, used spiteful language or displayed controversial opinions. ‘I was told today I was a pushy parent because my DS has a tutor at weekend (as school doesn’t meet his needs) and he plays football Saturday morning and Rugby Sunday morning. Although my husband takes him to the sport and has encouraged him to do this and I feel he needs a tutor, he is happy to take part in these activities. We only want the best for our child to succeed in life.’ Within this discussion the mother was perceived negatively due to her interfering with and making academic decisions and displaying negativity towards to school, yet her behaviour is still justifiable and within the best interest of the child. Although, just because some would view this mother negatively does not mean that behaviour is not appropriate.

### **Psychological findings**

Overall, when analysing the data collected from Mumsnet, there was a reoccurring underpinning and discrete theme of stress for young children to perform and live up to their parent’s support, encouragement or pushiness and forcefulness. Although the findings suggest that the behaviours were in the best interest of the child, that is how it was perceived online and from the parent’s perspective and did not come directly from the child.

Forceful parenting increases stress levels as well as impacting behaviour regulation for children, causing more problems (Hutchison, Feder, Abar & Winsler, 2016). Stress experienced by children can play a role in influencing the behaviour between the mother and child (Dittrich, Fuchs, Führer, Bermpohl, Kluczniok, Attar & Bödeker, 2017). Children can begin to resent their parent if they are always pressuring and forcing them to do something

they do not wish to do (Ryan & Connell, 1989). This form of psychological control pushy parents can be seen to have over their children can influence a child to meet the expectations in order to please their parent (Assor, Roth, & Deci, 2004). For example, many parents talk about what their child will do at university ‘I see her studying music at university’ and discuss their child’s future career ‘the next famous mathematician’, however, the child may feel pressured to follow their parent’s requirements, rather than following their own dreams.

Equally, some children thrive from pressure which motivates them to achieve, they may deal with stress in a healthy way (Wang & Neihart, 2015). Stress can increase a child’s resilience, impacting how well they recover from difficulties by engaging with their coping strategies (Baratta, Rozeske & Maier, 2013). This can be related as the children who are receiving pressure from their pushy parent can take it in their stride and allow them to challenge themselves and overcome obstacles, which promotes resilience (Smith & Carlson, 1997).

Another psychological aspect of pushy parenting that was evident within the discussions relates to the concepts from the self-determination theory. There are strong links between parenting and autonomous and controlled motivation within children. Autonomous motivation occurs when a person fully endorses a behaviours or experience freely and out of choice, whereas controlled motivation arises when a person feels forced or pressured into behaving a certain way (Hagger, Hardcastle, Chater, Mallett, Pal & Chatzisarantis, 2014). When exploring the definitions and traits of pushy parents, it would seem that this particular parenting style would promote controlled motivation within their children (Jungert, Landry, Joussemet, Mageau, Gingras & Koestner, 2015). Controlled motivation has been found to lower self-esteem, academic competence and social adjustment (Joussemet, Koestner, Leks & Landry, 2005; Vansteenkiste, Zhou, Lens & Soenens, 2005). Pushy parents tend to force their children to complete activities, perform in a certain way or act accordingly to their own

expectations (Marino, 2014; Grolnick, 2003), which encapsulates controlled motivation as the child feels obliged to do something by external or internal pressures (Sheldon & Elliot, 1998). Evidence of controlled motivation were suggestive within the discussions as parents displayed selfish tendencies, but justified their behaviours thinking this was reasonable, when actually the child may feel compelled into partaking due to the stress and pressure.

### **Implications**

The main aim of this study was to explore whether parents in the UK are seen to be displaying pushy parenting behaviours online. This has been done by exploring threads and discussions on Mumsnet, conducting a content analysis and producing statistically significant findings. Chi-square tests were run to explore any relationships between the behaviours of a pushy parent and the gender of the child, whether the behaviours are justifiable and are in the child's best interest and whether there is a link between the pushy parent's behaviours and whether the behaviour is associated with a negative or positive orientation towards the educator and the child.

Accordingly, the first major practical contribution of the present research is a deeper insight as well as more current and enhanced research into an apparent and developing parenting style within the UK. When reading existing literature there is little research directly associated with pushy parenting available in the UK, hence the important input of this current research. Similarly, this research will benefit psychologists, teachers and parents as it provides a deeper understanding about the type of parents displaying pushy parenting behaviours, the gender of the child, the types of behaviours, psychological impacts and how the behaviours are displayed towards the child and the educator. This will help professionals to work alongside these parents and have a better understanding of their traits and the impact these have upon children.

### **Limitations**

There are also limitations to this study, which will be discussed. Firstly, the categories for the initial codes were formed from the previous literature and did not immediately emerge from the data. This could have links to biases from the researcher as it may reflect what they want to look for and not what has naturally emerged (Liamputtong, 2012). The researcher may have looked specifically for data that can be categorised into the codes that have been developed from the previous literature. Although, it is important to note that whilst the first codes came solely from the literature, other codes were added which emerged from the data. This happened naturally as a deeper insight and meaning came from the raw data.

Another limitation is when the coding scheme was developed, the inter-rater reliability was not tested. Inter-rater reliability is the degree of similarity and agreement between raters and coders (Secolsky & Denison, 2012). Due to the codes being devised and applied by one coder, there is a chance of biases influencing the data (Brennan & Kane, 1979). The data was not coded by more than one coder and the data was not compared to check for similar findings, hence not knowing whether the data is reliable. Although, the study clearly states the procedure, making it easily replicable.

Lastly, the nature of the study being mainly qualitative, which involved analysing the discussions and the language, enhances the interpretation of the data by the researcher (Giles, 2016; Banister, 2011). Hence, when explaining the meaning of something, people will have different views and opinions and will view things in a different way (Carey, 2012). Therefore, how the data has been analysed may not be viewed as a good enough explanation due to someone else's interpretations.

However, overall there were many strengths of the study. As a teacher myself, this research was beneficial to me as a professional, providing more knowledge and a deeper

understanding of a under researched parenting style. This research has added great depth and some significant statistical findings as well as gaining meaning, a deeper understanding and different interpretations of pushy parenting. As well as this, the data collection used forming the analysis of an online discussion form provides a different, more current approach to research in a naturalistic setting.

### **Conclusion**

In this study, I have sought to carry out a deeper investigation into pushy parents in the UK, responding to a need of current research related to the parenting style. The aim of the study was to explore pushy parent's traits online, within an education context, establish what these behaviours are, whether they are justifiable and are in the child's best interest. An exploration into the pushy parenting behaviour and the gender of the child was accomplished and investigations into whether the behaviour is associated with a negative or positive orientation towards the educator and the child were undergone. The study found that pushy parenting is widely evident within online discussion forums, with the behaviours tending to be directed towards boys, especially when making academic decisions, which has been found to contrast with other existing research, which suggests the behaviour is dominantly shown towards girls. As suggested in other research, it was found that more positive comments were presented towards the pushy parent's child and more negative comments were directed towards the child's educator, with parents blaming the educators and education systems for why the child is not meeting their high expectations, which suggests pushy parents view their children as the 'apple of their eye'. Lastly, it was found that if the behaviour was seen to be in the best interest of the child it was also justification by the parent and when a parent's behaviour is perceived as being in the child's best interests, the mother is perceived positively.

These findings are significant and current within research surrounding pushy parents. Future research should explore deeper the gender differences within pushy parenting for both the child and the parent and investigate why there are gender differences.

### References

- Ablard, K. E., & Parker, W. D. (1997). Parents' achievement goals and perfectionism in their academically talented children. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 26(6), 651-667.  
doi:10.1023/A:1022392524554
- Albrecht, A. K., Galambos, N. L., & Jansson, S. M. (2007). Adolescents' internalizing and aggressive behaviors and perceptions of parents' psychological control: A panel study examining direction of effects. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36(5), 673-684.  
doi:10.1007/s10964-007-9191-5
- Alstott, A. (2004). *No exit: What parents owe their children and what society owes parents*. Oxford;New York;: Oxford University Press.
- Archer, L. (2010). 'We raised it with the Head': The educational practices of minority ethnic, middle-class families. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31, 449-469.  
doi:10.1080/01425692.2010.484921
- Arden, M. A., Duxbury, A. M. S., & Soltani, H. (2014). Responses to gestational weight management guidance: A thematic analysis of comments made by women in online parenting forums. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 14(1), 216-216. doi:10.1186/1471-2393-14-216
- Ashbourne, D., & Andres, L. (2015). Athletics, music, languages, and leadership: How parents influence the extracurricular activities of their children. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 38(2), 1.
- Assor, A., Roth, G., & Deci, E. L. (2004). The emotional costs of parents' conditional regard: A self-determination theory analysis. *Journal of Personality*, 72, 47-88.
- Athey, C. (2006). *Extending thought in young children: A parent-teacher partnership* (2nd ed.). London: Paul Chapman.



- Attanasio, O. P., & Kaufmann, K. M. (2014). Education choices and returns to schooling: Mothers' and youths' subjective expectations and their role by gender. *Journal of Development Economics*, 109, 203-216. doi:10.1016/j.jdeveco.2014.04.003
- Banister, P. (2011). *Qualitative methods in psychology: A research guide*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.
- Baratta, M. V., Rozeske, R. R., & Maier, S. F. (2013). Understanding stress resilience. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 7, 158. doi:10.3389/fnbeh.2013.00158
- Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development*, 67, 3296–3319.
- Barber, B. K., & Harmon, E. L. (2002). Violating the self: Parental psychological control of children and adolescents. In B. K. Barber (Ed.), *Intrusive parenting: How psychological control affects children and adolescents* (pp. 15–52). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association
- Barber, B. L., Eccles, J. S., & Stone, M. R. (2001). Whatever happened to the jock, the brain, and the princess? Young adult pathways linked to adolescent activity involvement and social identity. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 16(5), 429–455.
- Bartkus, K. R., Nemelka, B., Nemelka, M., & Gardner, P. (2012). Clarifying the meaning of extracurricular activity: A literature review of definitions. *American Journal of Business Education (Online)*, 5(6), 693.
- Beauvais, C. (2017). An exploration of the 'pushy parent' label in educational discourse. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 38(2), 159-13. doi:10.1080/01596306.2015.1064098
- Bicknell, B. (2014). Parental roles in the education of mathematically gifted and talented children. *Gifted Child Today*, 37(2), 83-93. doi:10.1177/1076217513497576

- Bigner, J. J., & Gerhardt, C. (2014). *Parent-child relations: An introduction to parenting* (Ninth ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Biyani, P., Caragea, C., Singh, A., & Mitra, P. (2012). I want what I need: Analyzing subjectivity of online forum threads. Paper presented at the 2495-2498.  
doi:10.1145/2396761.2398675
- Bois, J. E., Lalanne, J., & Delforge, C. (2009). The influence of parenting practices and parental presence on children's and adolescents' pre-competitive anxiety. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 27(10), 995. doi:10.1080/02640410903062001
- Bong, M. (2008). Effects of parent-child relationships and classroom goal structures on motivation, help-seeking avoidance, and cheating. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 76(2), 191-217. doi:10.3200/JEXE.76.2.191-217
- Bosetti, L., & Pyryt, M. C. (2007). Parental motivation in school choice: Seeking the competitive edge. *Journal of School Choice*, 1(4), 89. doi:10.1300/15582150802098795
- Brantlinger, E. (2003). *Dividing classes: How the middle class negotiates and rationalizes school advantage*. London: RoutledgeFalmer
- Brennan, R. L., & Kane, M. T. (1979). Generalizability theory: A review. In R. E Traub (Ed.), *Methodological developments* (pp 33-51). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- British Psychological Society (2013). Ethics Guidelines for Internet-mediated Research. INF206/1.2013. Leicester: Author. Retrieved 18 July 2017, from [www.bps.org.uk/publications/policy-andguidelines/research-guidelines-policydocuments/research-guidelines-policy](http://www.bps.org.uk/publications/policy-andguidelines/research-guidelines-policydocuments/research-guidelines-policy)
- Broomhead, K. (2014). 'A clash of two worlds'; disjuncture between the norms and values held by educational practitioners and parents of children with behavioural, emotional and

- social difficulties. *British Journal of Special Education*, 41(2), 136-150.  
doi:10.1111/1467-8578.12058
- Brotsky, S. R., & Giles, D. (2007). Inside the "pro-ana" community: A covert online participant observation. *Eating Disorders*, 15(2), 93-109.  
doi:10.1080/10640260701190600
- Brutsa, S., Gill, H., & Duniewicz, K. (2010). state of science in industrial and organizational psychology: A review of self- reported limitations. *Personnel Psychology*, 63(4), 907-936.  
doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01192.x
- Campbell, C., & Jane, B. (2012). Motivating children to learn: The role of technology education. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, 22(1), 1-11.  
doi:10.1007/s10798-010-9134-4
- Caplan, J. B., & Caplan, P. J. (2005). The perseverative search for sex differences in mathematics abilities. In A. M. Gallagher, & J. C. Kaufman (Eds.), *Gender differences in mathematics: An integrative psychological approach* (pp. 25–47). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511614446.003>.
- Carey, M. (2012). *Qualitative research skills for social work: Theory and practice*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Carmichael, C., MacDonald, A., & McFarland-Piazza, L. (2014). Predictors of numeracy performance in the national testing programs: Insights from the longitudinal study of Australian children. *British Educational Research Journal*, 40, 637–659. doi: 10.1002.berj.3104.
- Carter, R. S., & Wojtkiewicz, R. A. (2000). Parental involvement with adolescents' education: Do daughters or sons get more help? *Adolescence*, 35(137), 29-44.
- Chambers, J. C. (2006). "stop being so pushy!" applying the conflict cycle in work with families. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 15(3), 179.

- Chan, D. W., Chan, L., & Chan, A. C. (2013). Parenting gifted children among Hong Kong Chinese parents: What differences does westernization make? *Roeper Review*, 35(3), 177-186. doi:10.1080/02783193.2013.794891
- Chao, R.K. (2001). Extending research on the consequences of parenting style for Chinese Americans and European Americans. *Child Development*, 72(6), 1832-1843. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00381
- Cheah, C. S. L., Leung, C. Y. Y., & Zhou, N. (2013). Understanding "tiger parenting" through the perceptions of Chinese immigrant mothers: Can Chinese and U.S. parenting coexist? *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, 4(1), 30-40. doi:10.1037/a0031217
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Chua, A. (2011). *Battle Hymn of the Tiger Mother*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Cigman, R. (2006). The gifted child: A conceptual enquiry. *Oxford Review of Education*, 32(2), 197–212.
- Clarke-Stewart, K. A., Lee, Y., Allhusen, V. D., Kim, M. S., & McDowell, D. J. (2006). Observed differences between early childhood programs in the U.S. and Korea: Reflections of “developmentally appropriate practices” in two cultural contexts. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 27(5), 427-443. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2006.06.006
- Cocozza, P. (2016). Is David Cameron right to praise the ‘tiger mother’? *The Guardian*.
- Cole, M.S., Rubin, R.S., Feild, H.S. & Giles, W.F. (2007). Recruiters’ perceptions and use of applicant résumé information: Screening the recent graduate. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 56(2) 319-343.

Cross, J. R., & Cross, T. L. (2015). Clinical and mental health issues in counseling the gifted individual. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 93(2), 163-172. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.2015.00192.x

Crozier, G. (2000). *Parents and schools: Partners or protagonists?* Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Deary, I. J., Batty, G. D., Pattie, A., & Gale, C. R. (2008). More intelligent, more dependable children live longer: A 55-year longitudinal study of a representative sample of the Scottish nation. *Psychological Science*, 19(9), 874-880. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02171.x

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour. New York: Plenum. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1995). Human autonomy: The basis for true self-esteem. In M. H. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, agency, and self-esteem* (pp. 31–49). New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227–268

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being across life’s domains. *Canadian Psychology*, 49, 14–23. doi:[10.1037/0708-5591.49.1.14](https://doi.org/10.1037/0708-5591.49.1.14).

Denholm, A. (2016). Record number of parents complaining about teachers. *The Herald* (Glasgow, Scotland)

Dermott, E., & Pomati, M. (2016). ‘Good’ parenting practices: How important are poverty, education and time pressure? *Sociology*, 50(1), 125-142. doi:10.1177/0038038514560260

- Devine, A., Fawcett, K., Szűcs, D., & Dowker, A. (2012). Gender differences in mathematics anxiety and the relation to mathematics performance while controlling for test anxiety. *Behavioral and Brain Functions : BBF*, 8(1), 33-33. doi:10.1186/1744-9081-8-33
- Dittrich, K., Fuchs, A., Führer, D., Bermpohl, F., Kluczniok, D., Attar, C. H., & Bödeker, K. (2017). Observational context of mother-child interaction: Impact of a stress context on emotional availability. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 26(6), 1583. doi:10.1007/s10826-017-0678-8
- Drentea, P., & Moren-Cross, J. (2005). Social capital and social support on the web: the case of an Internet mother site. *Sociology of Health and Illness* 27, 920–943.
- Dwairy, M. (2004) 'Parenting styles and mental health of Arab gifted adolescents.' *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 48, 275–86.
- Dytham, C. (2011). *Choosing and using statistics: A biologist's guide* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R., Jackson, P., & Lowe, R. (2008). *Management research: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). London: Sage
- Ellis, L., Hershberger, S., Field, E., Wersinger, S., Pellis, S., & Geary, D, (2008). *Sex differences: summarizing more than a century of scientific research*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Else-Quest, N. M., Hyde, J. S., & Linn, M. C. (2010). Cross-national patterns of gender differences in mathematics: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(1), 103. doi:10.1037/a0018053.

- Else-Quest, N. M., Mineo, C. C., & Higgins, A. (2013). Math and science attitudes and achievement at the intersection of gender and ethnicity. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 37(3). doi:10.1177/0361684313480694.
- Espinoza, J. (2016). Parents don't always know best, say teachers; children should be made to study RE whatever their families think, say head teachers. *Daily Telegraph (London, England)*
- Fingerman, K. L., Cheng, Y., Wesselmann, E. D., Zarit, S., Furstenberg, F., & Birditt, K. S. (2012). Helicopter parents and landing pad kids: Intense parental support of grown children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(4), 880-896. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00987.x
- Fischer, F., Schult, J., & Hell, B. (2013). Sex differences in secondary school success: Why female students perform better. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 28(2), 529-543. doi:10.1007/s10212-012-0127-4
- Fredricks, J. A., Hackett, K., & Bregman, A. (2010). Participation in boys and girls clubs: Motivation and stage environment fit. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(3), 369-385. doi:10.1002/jcop.20369
- Freeman, J. (1991). *Gifted children growing up*. London: Heinemann Educational.
- Freeman, J. (2010). *Gifted Lives: What Happens When Gifted Children Grow Up*. London: Routledge.
- Friedman, H. L. (2014). Competitive kids: College admissions game starts early. *Education Next*, 14(1), 96.
- Gallant, P. A. (2009). Kindergarten teachers speak out: "too much, too soon, too fast!". *Reading Horizons*, 49(3), 201.

- Garhammer, M. (2002). Pace of life and enjoyment of life. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(3), 217-256. doi:10.1023/A:1020676100938
- Garn, A. C., Matthews, M. S., & Jolly, J. L. (2012). Parents' role in the academic motivation of students with gifts and talents. *Psychology in the Schools*, 49(7), 656-667. doi:10.1002/pits.21626
- Gavin, J., Rodham, K., & Poyer, H. (2008). The presentation of “Pro-anorexia” in online group interactions. *Qualitative Health Research*, 18(3), 325-333. doi:10.1177/1049732307311640
- Geist, E. A., & King, M. (2008). Different, not better: Gender differences in mathematics learning and achievement. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 35(1), 43.
- Gerver, R. (2010). *Creating tomorrow's schools today: Education - our children - their futures*. London: Continuum.
- Giles, D. C. (2016). Observing real- world groups in the virtual field: The analysis of online discussion. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 55(3), 484-498. doi:10.1111/bjso.12139
- Glass, T. F. (2004). What gift?: The reality of the student who is gifted and talented in public school classrooms. *Gifted Child Today*, 27(4), 25-29. doi:10.4219/gct-2004-152
- Goodhew, G. (2009). *Meeting the needs of gifted and talented students*. London: Network Continuum.
- Göransson, K. (2015). Raising successful children: Children as accumulation strategy and the renegotiation of parenting arrangements in singapore. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, 16(3), 211-226. doi:10.1080/14442213.2015.1028431
- Greene, J., & D'Oliveira, M. (2005). *Learning to use statistical tests in psychology* (3rd ed.). Maidenhead: Open University Press.



- Grek, S. (2009). Governing by numbers: The PISA 'effect' in Europe. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(1), 23-37. doi:10.1080/02680930802412669
- Grolnick, W. S. (2003). *The psychology of parental control: How well-meant parenting backfires*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gunnarsdottir, H., Bjereld, Y., Hensing, G., Petzold, M., & Povlsen, L. (2015). Associations between parents' subjective time pressure and mental health problems among children in the nordic countries: A population based study. *BMC Public Health*, 15(1), 353. doi:10.1186/s12889-015-1634-4
- Gurian, M., Henley, P., & Trueman, T. (2000). *Boys and girls learn differently: A guide for teachers and parents* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hadert, A., & Rodham, K. (2008). The invisible reality of arthritis: A qualitative analysis of an online message board. *Musculoskeletal Care*, 6(3), 181-196. doi:10.1002/msc.131
- Hagger, M. S., Hardcastle, S. J., Chater, A., Mallett, C., Pal, S., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (2014). Autonomous and controlled motivational regulations for multiple health-related behaviors: Between- and within-participants analyses. *Health Psychology and Behavioral Medicine: An Open Access Journal*, 2(1), 565-601. doi:10.1080/21642850.2014.912945
- Hallam, S., Rogers, L., & Creech, A. (2002). Gender differences in musical instrument choice. *International Journal of Music Education*, 26(1) 7–19.
- Halliwell, R. (2015). I'm a recovering pushy parent; as 80 per cent of mothers admit to being ferociously competitive, Rachel Halliwell reveals why she took her foot off the pedal. *Daily Telegraph (London, England)*
- Halpern, D. F. (2000). *Sex differences in cognitive abilities* (3rd ed.). Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Hamachek, D. E. (1978). Psychodynamics of normal and neurotic perfectionism. *Psychology*, 15, 27–33

- Hargreaves, M., Homer, M., & Swinnerton, B. (2008). A comparison of performance and attitudes in mathematics amongst the 'gifted'. are boys better at mathematics or do they just think they are? *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 15(1), 19-38. doi:10.1080/09695940701876037
- Hargrove, K. (2013). From the classroom: “Exam Schools”—Are they the solution for gifted students? *Gifted Child Today*, 36(1), 68-70. doi:10.1177/1076217512465286
- Harris, A., & Goodall, J. (2008). Do parents know they matter? engaging all parents in learning. *Educational Research*, 50(3), 277-289. doi:10.1080/00131880802309424
- Hibbard, D. R., & Walton, G. E. (2014). Exploring the development of perfectionism: The influence of parenting style and gender. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 42(2), 269-278. doi:10.2224/sbp.2014.42.2.269
- Higginson, J. G. (1998). Competitive parenting: The culture of teen mothers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 60(1), 135-149.
- Hiltz, J. (2015). Helicopter parents: Can be a good thing: Overprotective and overinvolved parents generally get a bad rap, but they can be a teacher's ally and asset. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 96(7), 26.
- Hinton, P. R., McMurray, I., & Brownlow, C. (2014). *SPSS explained* (Second ed.). London: Routledge.
- Hollway, W., & Jefferson, T. (2013). *Doing qualitative research differently: A psychosocial approach* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE.
- Holt, N. L., Tamminen, K. A., Black, D. E., Mandigo, J. L., & Fox, K. R. (2009). Youth sport parenting styles and practices. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 31, 37–59.

- Hoover- Dempsey, K., Walker, J., Sandler, H., Whetsel, D., Green, C., Wilkins, A., & Closson, K. (2005). Why do parents become involved? research findings and implications. *The Elementary School Journal*, 106(2), 105-130. doi:10.1086/499194
- Hornby, G., & Lafaele, R. (2011). Barriers to parental involvement in education: An explanatory model. *Educational Review*, 63(1), 37-52.  
doi:10.1080/00131911.2010.488049
- Howe, M. J. A. (1990). *Sense and nonsense about hothouse children*. Leicester: British Psychological Society.
- Howitt, D., & Cramer, D. (2000). *First steps in research and statistics: A practical workbook for psychology students*. Philadelphia, Pa;London;: Routledge.
- Hsieh, H., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288. doi:10.1177/1049732305276687
- Huff, R. E., Houskamp, B. M., Watkins, A. V., Stanton, M., & Tavegia, B. (2005). The experiences of gifted African American children: A phenomenological study. *Roeper Review*, 27, 215-221.
- Hughes, A. M., & Read, V. (2012). *Building positive relationships with parents of young children: A guide to effective communication*. London: Routledge.
- Hurst, G. (2015). Pushy parents may not get better results. *The Times (London, England)*
- Hutchison, L., Feder, M., Abar, B., & Winsler, A. (2016). Relations between parenting stress, parenting style, and child executive functioning for children with ADHD or autism. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25(12), 3644-3656. doi:10.1007/s10826-016-0518-2

- Ireson, J., & Rushforth, K. (2011). Private tutoring at transition points in the english education system: Its nature, extent and purpose. *Research Papers in Education*, 26(1), 1-19. doi:10.1080/02671520903191170
- Ireson, J., & Rushforth, K. (2014). Why do parents employ private tutors for their children?: Exploring psychological factors that influence demand in England. *Journal for Educational Research Online*, 6(1), 12.
- Jacobs, J. E., & Bleeker, M. M. (2004). Girls' and boys' developing interests in math and science: Do parents matter? *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 2004(106), 5-21. doi:10.1002/cd.113
- Jacobs, N., & Harvey, D. (2005). Do parents make a difference to children's academic achievement? differences between parents of higher and lower achieving students. *Educational Studies*, 31(4), 431. doi:10.1080/03055690500415746
- Jago, R., Davis, L., McNeill, J., Sebire, S. J., Haase, A., Powell, J., & Cooper, A. R. (2011). Adolescent girls' and parents' views on recruiting and retaining girls into an after-school dance intervention: Implications for extra-curricular physical activity provision. *The International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 8(1), 91-91. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-8-91
- James, D., Reay, D., Crozier, G., Beedell, P., Hollingworth, S., Jamieson, F., & Williams, K. (2010). Neoliberal policy and the meaning of counterintuitive middle-class school choices. *Current Sociology*, 58, 623–641. doi:10.1177/0011392110368003
- Janssens, A., Goossens, L., Van Den Noortgate, W., Colpin, H., Verschueren, K., & Van Leeuwen, K. (2015). Parents' and adolescents' perspectives on parenting: Evaluating conceptual structure, measurement invariance, and criterion validity. *Assessment*, 22(4), 473.

- Jeynes, W. H. (2010). *Parental involvement and academic success*. London: Routledge.
- Jolly, J. L., & Matthews, M. S. (2012). A critique of the literature on parenting gifted learners. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 35(3), 259-290.  
doi:10.1177/0162353212451703
- Joussemet, M., Koestner, R., Lekes, N., & Landry, R. (2005). A longitudinal study of relationship of maternal autonomy support to children's adjustment and achievement in school. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 1215–1235
- Joussemet, M., Landry, R., & Koestner, R. (2008). A self-determination theory perspective on parenting. *Canadian Psychology*, 49(3), 194-200. doi:10.1037/a0012754
- Jowett, A. (2015). A case for using online discussion forums in critical psychological research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12(3), 287-297.  
doi:10.1080/14780887.2015.1008906
- Jung-Tae, L., Min-Chul, Y., & Hae-Chang, R. (2014). Discovering high-quality threaded discussions in online forums. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, 29(3), 519-531. doi:10.1007/s11390-014-1446-5
- Jungert, T., Landry, R., Joussemet, M., Mageau, G., Gingras, I., & Koestner, R. (2015). Autonomous and controlled motivation for parenting: Associations with parent and child outcomes. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 24(7), 1932-1942. doi:10.1007/s10826-014-9993-5
- Kane, E. W. (2012). *The gender trap: Parents and the pitfalls of raising boys and girls*. New York, NY: New York University.
- Kawamura, K. Y., Frost, R. O., & Harmatz, M. G. (2002). The relationship of perceived parenting styles to perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 317-327.  
doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(01)00026-5

- Kenny, R., Dooley, B., & Fitzgerald, A. (2013). Interpersonal relationships and emotional distress in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 36(2), 351.
- Kilic, S. (2016). Chi-square test. *Journal of Mood Disorders*, 6(3), 180.  
doi:10.5455/jmood.20160803110534
- Knass, K. (2013). Parents want the best for their children and we want to help them to get that: The boulevard academy will open its doors in September. education reporter Katie Knass talks to its new principal. *Hull Daily Mail*
- Knowles, R., & Wilkinson, C. (2017). The worries of weaning: Newspaper reporting of infant weaning and its impact on dialogue in online discussion forums. *Journalism*, 18(3), 350-367. doi:10.1177/1464884915620230
- Koshy, S. (2013). Neoliberal family matters. *American Literary History*, 25(2), 344-380.  
doi:10.1093/alh/ajt006
- Koshy, V., & Pinheiro- Torres, C. (2013). ‘Are we being de- gifted, miss?’ primary school gifted and talented co- ordinators’ responses to the gifted and talented education policy in England. *British Educational Research Journal*, 39(6), 953-978. doi:10.1002/berj.3021
- Lamberton, L., Devaney, J., & Bunting, L. (2016). New challenges in family support: The use of digital technology in supporting parents. *Child Abuse Review*, 25(5), 359-372.  
doi:10.1002/car.2451
- Lang, S. N., Tolbert, A. R., Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J., & Bonomi, A. E. (2016). A cocaring framework for infants and toddlers: Applying a model of coparenting to parent–teacher relationships. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 34, 40-52.  
doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2015.08.004
- Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods. Class, race and family life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Lasater, K. (2016). Parent-teacher conflict related to student abilities: The impact on students and the family-school partnership. *School Community Journal*, 26(2), 237.
- Lavoi, N. M., & Stellino, M. B. (2008). The relation between perceived parent-created sport climate and competitive male youth hockey players' good and poor sport behaviors. *The Journal of Psychology*, 142(5), 471-496. doi:10.3200/JRLP.142.5.471-496
- Lee, M. A., Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J., & Kamp Dush, C. M. (2012). Parenting perfectionism and parental adjustment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(3), 454-457. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.10.047
- Levine, J. (2003). *Know your parenting personality: How to use the enneagram to become the best parent you can be*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Liamputtong, P. (2012). *Qualitative research methods* (4th ed.). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Lightfoot, L. (2009). 'parents to blame' for problems in UK schools: families 'are undermining teachers': union leader in plea over behaviour. *The Observer* (London, England).
- Lindberg, S. M., Hyde, J. S., Petersen, J. L., & Linn, M. C. (2010). New trends in gender and mathematic performance. *A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin*, 136(6), 1123–1135. doi:10.1037/a0021276.
- Lingard, B., Martino, W., & Mills, M. (2009). *Boys and schooling*. London: Palgrave.
- Livingston, J., Schmidt, C., & Lehman, S. (2016). Competitive club soccer: Parents' assessments of children's early and later sport specialization. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 39(3), 301.

- Lloyd, J. E. V., Walsh, J., & Yailagh, M. S. (2005). Sex differences in performance attributions, self-efficacy, and achievement in mathematics: if I'm so smart, why don't I know it? *Canadian Journal of Education*, 28(3), 384–408. doi:10.2307/4126476.
- Lucey, H., & Reay, D. (2002). Carrying the beacon of excellence: Social class differentiation and anxiety at the time of transition. *Journal of Education Policy*, 7, 321–336.
- Ludicke, P., & Kortman, W. (2012). Tensions in home-school partnerships: The different perspectives of teachers and parents of students with learning barriers. *Australasian Journal of Special Education*, 36(2), 155–171. doi:10.1017/jse.2012.13
- Lui, P. P., & Rollock, D. (2013). Tiger mother: Popular and psychological scientific perspectives on Asian culture and parenting. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 83(4), 450–456. doi:10.1111/ajop.12043
- Lupton, D., Pedersen, S., & Thomas, G. (2016). Parenting and digital media: from the early web to contemporary digital society. *Sociology Compass*, 10(8), 730–743.
- Macintyre, C. (2008). *Gifted and talented children 4-11: Understanding and supporting their development*. London: Routledge.
- Mackenzie, J. (2017). 'Can we have a child exchange?' constructing and subverting the 'good mother' through play in mumsnet talk. *Discourse & Society*, 28(3), 296–312. doi:10.1177/0957926516687417
- Madge, C., & O'Connor, H. (2005). Mothers in the making? Exploring liminality in cyber/space. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 30(1), 83–97.
- Madge, C., & O'Connor, H. (2006). Parenting gone wired: empowerment of new mothers on the internet? *Social & Cultural Geography*, 7, 199–220.



- Mageau, G. A., Bureau, J. S., Ranger, F., Allen, M., & Soenens, B. (2016). The role of parental achievement goals in predicting autonomy-supportive and controlling parenting. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25(5), 1702. doi:10.1007/s10826-015-0341-1
- Mahoney, J. L., Schweder, A. E., & Stattin, H. (2002). Structured afterschool activities as a moderator of depressed mood for adolescents with detached relations to their parents. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(1), 69–86.
- Mandiberg, M. (2012). *The social media reader* (1st ed.). Chesham: University Press.
- Mangan, L. (2016). Why it's perfectly natural to dislike other people's children; mumsnet is fiercely debating whether it is acceptable take against a friend's child. of course it is, says Lucy Mangan. *Daily Telegraph (London, England)*
- Manos, M. A. (2009). Helicopter parents: Empathetic or pathetic? *Phi Kappa Phi Forum*, 89(3), 21.
- Marino, G. (2014). Confessions of an obsessive sports dad; there's nothing wrong with living through your children on the field. advice for tiger sports parents. *Wall Street Journal (Online)*
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2010). *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Martinot, D., & Désert, M. (2007). Awareness of a gender stereotype, personal beliefs and self-perceptions regarding math ability: When boys do not surpass girls. *Social Psychology of Education*, 10(4), 455-471. doi:10.1007/s11218-007-9028-9
- Matthias Arnold, J., & Javorcik, B. S. (2009). Gifted kids or pushy parents? foreign direct investment and plant productivity in Indonesia. *Journal of International Economics*, 79(1), 42-53. doi:10.1016/j.jinteco.2009.05.004

- McEntire, N. (2009). THE IMPORTANCE OF PLAY: Why children need to play. *Childhood Education*, 85(3), 208.
- Miller, S. (2010). *Supporting parents: Improving outcomes for children, families and communities*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Miller, A. L., Lambert, A. D., & Speirs Neumeister, K. L. (2012). Parenting style, perfectionism, and creativity in high-ability and high-achieving young adults. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 35, 344–365. doi:10.1177/0162353212459257
- Minello, A., & Blossfeld, H. (2017). From parents to children: The impact of mothers' and fathers' educational attainments on those of their sons and daughters in west Germany. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 38(5), 686-16.  
doi:10.1080/01425692.2016.1150156
- Monducci, E., Battaglia, C., Forte, A., Masillo, A., Telesforo, L., Carlotto, A., & Fiori Nastro, P. (2016). Secondary school teachers and mental health competence: Italy-United Kingdom comparison: Teachers and mental health competence. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*, doi:10.1111/eip.12345
- Moore, D. G., Burland, K., & Davidson, J. W. (2003). The social context of musical success: A developmental account. *British Journal of Psychology*, 94(4), 529-549.  
doi:10.1348/000712603322503088
- Morawska, A., & Sanders, M. R. (2008). Parenting gifted and talented children: What are the key child behaviour and parenting issues? *Australasian Psychiatry*, 42(9), 819-827.  
doi:10.1080/00048670802277271

- Morawska, A., & Sanders, M. (2009). An evaluation of a behavioural parenting intervention for parents of gifted children. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 47(6), 463-470.  
doi:10.1016/j.brat.2009.02.008
- Mumsnet census. (2009). Mumsnet census 2009. Retrieved 18 July 2017, from <http://www.mumsnet.com/info/media/census-2009>
- Mumsnet. (2011). Mumsnet: By parents for parents. 'About us'. Retrieved 22 July 2017, <http://www.mumsnet.com/info/aboutus>
- Na, J. C., & Chia, S. W. (2008). Impact of online resources on informal learners: parents' perceptions of their parenting skills. *Computers and Education*, 51, 173-186.
- Nader, P. R., Bradley, R. H., Houts, R. M., McRitchie, S. L., & O'Brien, M. (2008). Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity from ages 9 to 15 years. *Jama*, 300(3), 295.
- Naumann, L. P., Guillaume, E. M., & Funder, D. C. (2012). The correlates of high parental academic expectations: An asian-latino comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 43(4), 515-520. doi:10.1177/0022022112438398
- Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th, Pearson New International ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Niederle, M., & Vesterlund, L. (2007). Do women shy away from competition? Do men compete too much? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122, 1067-1101.
- O'Connor, H., & Madge, C. (2004). 'my mum's thirty years out of date'. *Community, Work & Family*, 7(3), 351-369. doi:10.1080/1366880042000295754
- Pandis, N. (2016). The chi-square test. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*, 150(5), 898-899. doi:10.1016/j.ajodo.2016.08.009

- Parker, G. (1983). *Parental overprotection: A risk factor in psychosocial development*. New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Pedersen, S. (2016). The good, the bad and the ‘good enough’ mother on the UK parenting forum mumsnet. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 59, 32-38.  
doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2016.09.004
- Pedersen, S., & Smithson, J. (2013). Mothers with attitude – How the Mumsnet parenting forum offers space for new forms of femininity to emerge online. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 38, 97-106. DOI: 10.1016/j.wsif.2013.03.004.
- Pendry, L. F., & Salvatore, J. (2015). Individual and social benefits of online discussion forums. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 50, 211-220. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.03.067
- Peterson, E. R., Rubie-Davies, C. M., Elley-Brown, M. J., Widdowson, D. A., Dixon, R. S., & Irving, S. E. (2011). Who is to blame? students, teachers and parents views on who is responsible for student achievement. *Research in Education*, (86), 1.
- Pfeiffer, S. I., & Stocking, V. B. (2000). Vulnerabilities of academically gifted students. *Special Services in the Schools*, 16(1-2), 83–93.
- Phillips, N., & Broderick, A. (2014). Has mumsnet changed me? SNS influence on identity adaptation and consumption. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 30(9-10), 1039-1057.  
doi:10.1080/0267257X.2014.927899
- Plantin, L., & Daneback, K. (2009). Parenthood, information and support on the internet: a literature review of research on parents and professionals online. *BMC Family Practice* 10, doi: 10.1186/ 1471-2296-10-34
- Porter, N., & Ispa, J. M. (2013). Mothers’ online message board questions about parenting infants and toddlers. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 69(3), 559-568. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.2012.06030.x

- Potter, W. J., & Levine-Donnerstein, D. (1999). Rethinking validity and reliability in content analysis. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 27, 258-284
- Preckel, F., Goetz, T., Pekrun, R., & Kleine, M. (2008). Gender differences in gifted and averageability students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 52(2), 146–159.
- Ravid, R. (2010). *Practical statistics for educators* (4th ed.). Rowman and Littlefield
- Reback, R., Rockoff, J., & Schwartz, H. L. (2014). Under pressure: Job security, resource allocation, and productivity in schools under no child left behind. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 6(3), 207-241. doi:10.1257/pol.6.3.207
- Reese, E., Peterson, E. R., Waldie, K., Schmidt, J., Bandara, D., Carr, P. A., & Morton, S. M. B. (2016). High hopes? educational, socioeconomic, and ethnic differences in parents' aspirations for their unborn children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25(12), 3657-3674. doi:10.1007/s10826-016-0521-7
- Reid, A. (2016). The use and abuse of research in the public domain. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 43(1), 75-91. doi:10.1007/s13384-015-0184-1
- Reid, C. A. Y., Roberts, L. D., Roberts, C. M., & Piek, J. P. (2015). Towards a model of contemporary parenting: The parenting behaviours and dimensions questionnaire: E0114179. *PLoS One*, 10(6) doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0114179
- Riddoch, C. J., Mattocks, C., Deere, K., Saunders, J., Kirkby, J., Tilling, K., & Ness, A. R. (2007). Objective measurement of levels and patterns of physical activity. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 92(11), 963-969. doi:10.1136/adc.2006.112136
- Roberts, L. D. (2015). Ethical issues in conducting qualitative research in online communities. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12(3), 314-325. doi:10.1080/14780887.2015.1008909

- Robinson, W., & Campbell, R. J. (2010). *Effective teaching in gifted education: Using a whole school approach*. London: Routledge.
- Rochelle, T. L., & Cheng, H. T. (2016). Parenting practices and child behaviour problems in hong kong: Knowledge of effective parenting strategies, parenting stress, and child-rearing ideologies. *Child Indicators Research*, 9(1), 155-171. doi:10.1007/s12187-015-9311-9
- Rodham, K., McCabe, C., & Blake, D. (2009). Seeking support: An interpretative phenomenological analysis of an internet message board for people with complex regional pain syndrome. *Psychology & Health*, 24(6), 619-634. doi:10.1080/08870440802563245
- Rosa, H. (2003). Social acceleration: Ethical and political consequences of a desynchronized High-Speed society. *Constellations*, 10(1), 3-33. doi:10.1111/1467-8675.00309
- Rothbaum, F., Martland, N., & Jannsen, J. B. (2008). Parents' reliance on the web to find information about children and families — socio-economic differences in use, skills and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 29(2), 118–128.
- Rotigel, J. V. (2003). Understanding the young gifted children: Guidelines for parents, families, and educators. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 30, 209-214.
- Rubie-Davies, C. M. (2007). Classroom interactions: Exploring the practices of high- and low-expectation teachers. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(Pt 2), 289-306. doi:10.1348/000709906X101601
- Rubie-Davies, C. M., Peterson, E., Irving, E., Widdowson, D., & Dixon, R. (2010). Expectations of achievement: Student, teacher and parent perceptions. *Research in Education*, (83), 36.
- Rutherford, T. (2015). Emotional well-being and discrepancies between child and parent educational expectations and aspirations in middle and high school. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 20(1), 69-85. doi:10.1080/02673843.2013.767742

- Rytönen, K., Aunola, K., and Nurmi, J. E. (2005), 'Parents' causal attributions concerning their children's school achievement: A longitudinal study', *MerrillPalmer Quarterly-Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 51, 494–522
- Rytönen, K., Aunola, K., and Nurmi, J. E. (2007), 'Do parents' causal attributions predict the accuracy and bias in their children's self-concept of maths ability? A longitudinal study', *Educational Psychology*, 27, 6, 771–788.
- Sallis, J. (2006). How to keep pushy parents at bay. *The Times Educational Supplement*, (4687), 30.
- Saner, E. (2015). Are pushy parents putting children off sport? *The Guardian*
- Santiago, R. T., Garbacz, S. A., Beattie, T., & Moore, C. L. (2016). parent- teacher relationships in elementary school: An examination of parent- teacher trust. *Psychology in the Schools*, 53(10), 1003-1017. doi:10.1002/pits.21971
- Sarkadi, A., & Bremberg, S. (2005). Socially unbiased parenting support on the Internet: a cross-sectional study of users of a large Swedish parenting website. *Child: Care, Health and Development* 31, 43–52.
- Schaefer, E. S. (1965). A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behavior. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 29, 552–557
- Schiffrin, H. H., & Liss, M. (2017). The effects of helicopter parenting on academic motivation. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 26(5), 1472. doi:10.1007/s10826-017-0658-
- Schiffrin, H. H., Liss, M., Miles-McLean, H., Geary, K. A., Erchull, M. J., & Tashner, T. (2014). Helping or hovering? the effects of helicopter parenting on college students' well-

- being. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 23(3), 548-557. doi:10.1007/s10826-013-9716-3
- Schmidt, C. K., Raque-Bogdan, T. L., Piontkowski, S., & Schaefer, K. L. (2011). Putting the positive in health psychology: A content analysis of three journals. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 16(4), 607-620. doi:10.1177/1359105310384296
- Seale, C., Charteris-Black, J., MacFarlane, A., & McPherson, A. (2010). Interviews and Internet forums: a comparison of two sources of qualitative data, *Qualitative Health Research*, 20(5), 595–606.
- Secolsky, C., & Denison, D. B. (2012). *Handbook on measurement, assessment, and evaluation in higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203142189
- Segrin, C., Givertz, M., Swaitkowski, P., & Montgomery, N. (2015). Overparenting is associated with child problems and a critical family environment. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 24(2), 470-479. doi:10.1007/s10826-013-9858-3
- Segrin, C., Wosidlo, A., Givertz, M., Bauer, A., & Murphy, M. T. (2012). The association between overparenting, parent-child communication, and entitlement and adaptive traits in adult children. *Family Relations*, 61, 237–252. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2011.00689.x.
- Sheldon, K. M., & Elliot, A. J. (1998). Not all personal goals are personal: Comparing autonomous and controlled reasons as predictors of effort and attainment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 546–557.
- Sheriff, L. (2013). A-Level results: Students forced into university by pushy parents, poor advice, target driven teachers. Huffington Post. Retrieved 27 July 2017, from [http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2013/08/12/a-levels-students-forced-university-pushy-parents\\_n\\_3742983.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2013/08/12/a-levels-students-forced-university-pushy-parents_n_3742983.html)



- Sime, D., & Sheridan, M. (2014). 'you want the best for your kids': Improving educational outcomes for children living in poverty through parental engagement. *Educational Research*, 56(3), 327-342. doi:10.1080/00131881.2014.934556
- Simoncini, K., & Caltabiono, N. (2012). Young school-aged children's behaviour and their participation in extra-curricular activities. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 37(3), 35-42.
- Simpkins, S. D., Davis-Kean, P. E., & Eccles, J. S. (2005). Parents' socializing behavior and children's participation in math, science, and computer out-of-school activities. *Applied Developmental Science*, 9, 14–30
- Skea, Z, C., Entwistle, V, A., Watt, I., & Russell, E. (2008). 'Avoiding harm to others' considerations in relation to parental measles, mumps and rubella (MMR) vaccination discussions – An analysis of an online chat forum. *Social Science & Medicine*, 67, 1382–1390.
- Skelton, C., & Francis, B. (2011). Successful boys and literacy: Are "literate boys" challenging or repackaging hegemonic masculinity? *Curriculum Inquiry*, 41(4), 456. doi:10.1111/j.1467-873X.2011.00559.x
- Smith, C. M. M. (2006). *Including the gifted and talented: Making inclusion work for more gifted and able learners*. New York;London;: Routledge.
- Smith, E. (2010). Underachievement, failing youth and moral panics. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, 23(1), 37-49. doi:10.1080/09500791003605102
- Smith, J. A. (2015). *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods* (3rd ed.). London;Los Angeles;: SAGE.

- Smith, C., & Carlson, B. E. (1997). Stress, coping, and resilience in children and youth. *Social Service Review*, 71(2), 231-256. doi:10.1086/604249
- Smith, E., & Smith, M. (1997). Multiple criteria from a parent's perspective or we all want the best for our children. *Roeper Review*, 20(2), A6-A8. doi:10.1080/02783199709553869
- Smith, P. K., Smith, C., Osborn, R., & Samara, M. (2008). A content analysis of school anti-bullying policies: Progress and limitations. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 24(1), 1-12. doi:10.1080/02667360701661165
- Snell, W. E., Overbey, G. A., & Brewer, A. L. (2005). Parenting perfectionism and the parenting role. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39, 613–624.
- Soenens, B., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2010). A theoretical upgrade of the concept of parental psychological control: Proposing new insights on the basis of self-determination theory. *Developmental Review*, 30(1), 74-99. doi:10.1016/j.dr.2009.11.001
- Southerton, D., & Tomlinson, M. (2005). 'Pressed for time' – the differential impacts of a 'time squeeze'. *The Sociological Review*, 53(2), 215-239. doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.2005.00511.x
- Spiegel, M. R., & Stephens, L. J. (2008). *Schaum's outline of theory and problems of statistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Stephens, L. (2006). *Schaum's outline of beginning statistics* (2nd ed.). London: McGraw-Hill.
- Stoeber, J., & Otto, K. (2006). Positive conceptions of perfectionism: Approaches, evidence, challenges. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(4), 295–319.

- Stoeber, J., & Rambow, A. (2007). Perfectionism in adolescent school students: Relations with motivation, achievement, and well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(7), 1379-1389. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2006.10.015
- Stone, T. (2010). Pushy parents: Problems, tips and techniques. *Child Care*, 7(4), 22-23. doi:10.12968/chca.2010.7.4.47183
- Su, C., & Hynie, M. (2011). Effects of life stress, social support, and cultural norms on parenting styles among Mainland Chinese, European Canadian, and Chinese Canadian immigrant mothers. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 42, 944-962.
- Sullivan, B. (2013). Hover charge. *ABA Journal*, 99(3), 71.
- Sutherland, M. B. (2012). *Gifted & talented in the early years: Practical activities for children aged 3 to 6* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE.
- The British Psychological Society. (2014). *Code of Human Research Ethics*. Retrieved 18 July 2017, from <http://www.bps.org.uk/publications/policy-and-guidelines/research-guidelines-policy-documents/research-guidelines-poli>
- Timmermans, A. C., de Boer, H., & van der Werf, Margaretha P. C. (2016). An investigation of the relationship between teachers' expectations and teachers' perceptions of student attributes. *Social Psychology of Education*, 19(2), 217-240. doi:10.1007/s11218-015-9326-6
- Tucker, S. (2010). An investigation of the stresses, pressures and challenges faced by primary school head teachers in a context of organisational change in schools. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, 24(1), 63-74. doi:10.1080/02650530903532765
- Uji, M., Sakamoto, A., Adachi, K., & Kitamura, T. (2014). The impact of authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles on children's later mental health in japan:

- Focusing on parent and child gender. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 23(2), 293.  
doi:10.1007/s10826-013-9740-3
- Underdown, A. (2007). *Young children's health and well-being*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Valaitis, R. K., & Sword, W. A. (2005). Online discussions with pregnant and parenting adolescents: Perspectives and possibilities. *Health Promotion Practice*, 6(4), 464-471.  
doi:10.1177/1524839904263897
- Van Deventer, K. J., & Malan, P. E. (2013). Perceived physical characteristics, personal and social reasons for adolescent sports participation among 15- and 17-year-old boys and girls in the western cape province, south africa. *African Journal for Physical Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 19(4\_1), 937-953.
- Vansteenkiste, M., Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2008). Self-determination theory and the explanatory role of psychological needs in human well-being. In L. Bruni, F. Comim, & M. Pugno (Eds.), *Capabilities and happiness* (pp. 187–223). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Vansteenkiste, M., Zhou, M., Lens, W., & Soenens, B. (2005). Experiences of autonomy and control among Chinese learners: Vitalizing or immobilizing? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97, 468–483.
- Vaughan, R. (2013). *Think your school's parents are pushy?* Times Supplements Ltd.
- Venkatesan, S. (2011). Blame game triangulation between parents, teachers and children with academic problems. *Psychological Studies*, 56(2), 206-215. doi:10.1007/s12646-011-0082-1

- Vincent, C., & Ball, S. J. (2007). 'Making up' the middle-class child: Families, activities and class dispositions. *Sociology*, 41, 1061–1077. doi:10.1177/0038038507082315
- Vogt, W. P., Gardner, D. C., & Haeffele, L. M. (2012). *When to use what research design*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Wagner, W. E. (2010). *Using SPSS for social statistics and research methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif: Pine Forge Press.
- Walther, J. B. (2002). Research ethics in Internet-enabled research: human subjects issues and methodological myopia', *Ethics and Information Technology*, 4(3), 205–16.
- Wang, C. W., & Neihart, M. (2015). How do supports from parents, teachers, and peers influence academic achievement of twice-exceptional students. *Gifted Child Today*, 38(3), 148-159. doi:10.1177/1076217515583742
- Warrell, J. G., & Jacobsen, M. (2014). Internet research ethics and the policy gap for ethical practice in online research settings. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 44(1), 22.
- Watson, G. L., Sanders-Lawson, E. R., & McNeal, L. (2012). Understanding parental involvement in American Public Education. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(19), 41–50
- Weis, M., Heikamp, T., & Trommsdorff, G. (2013). Gender differences in school achievement: The role of self-regulation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4, Article 442. [http://dx. doi.org/10.3389/fpsych.2013.00442](http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsych.2013.00442).
- Whitehead, S., & Biddle, S. (2008). Adolescent girls' perceptions of physical activity: A focus group study. *European Physical Education Review*, 14(2), 243-262. doi:10.1177/1356336X08090708

- Whitney, B. (2004). *Protecting children: A handbook for teachers and school managers* (2nd ed.). New York;London;: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Why pushy parents can lead to pupils being wrongly diagnosed. (2017). *The Yorkshire Post*
- Wieteska, M. (2017). Chinese education in the novel by A. chua battle hymn of the tiger mother. *Journal of Education Culture and Society*, (1), 201-208.  
doi:10.15503/jecs20171.201.208
- Wijsbroek, S. A. M., Hale III, W. W., Raaijmakers, Q. A. W., & Meeus, W. H. J. (2011). The direction of effects between perceived parental behavioral control and psychological control and adolescents' self-reported GAD and SAD symptoms. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 20(7), 361-371. doi:10.1007/s00787-011-0183-3
- Willig, C. (2012). *Qualitative interpretation and analysis in psychology*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Winstanley, C. (2004). *Too clever by half: A fair deal for gifted children*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Wiszniewski, D., & Coyne, R. (2002). Mask and identity: The hermeneutics of self-construction in the information age. In K. A. Renninger & W. Shumar (Eds.), *Building virtual communities* (pp. 191-214). New York: Cambridge University Press
- Wu, E. H. (2008). Parental influence on children's talent development: A case study with three Chinese American families. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 32(1), 100-129.  
doi:10.4219/jeg-2008-826
- Yi, J. (2013). Tiger moms and liberal elephants: Private, supplemental education among Korean Americans. *Society*, 50(2), 190-195. doi:10.1007/s12115-013-9638-0

Youm, H. K. (2013). Parents' goals, knowledge, practices, and needs regarding music education for their young children in south Korea. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 61(3), 280-302. doi:10.1177/0022429413497233

## Appendices

### Appendix A

Initial	Discussion	Notes
T1D1	<p>Okay I know this is a <b>smug post</b> but I can't exactly go round telling all and sundry in real life so the internet is getting it.</p> <p><b>DS's SAT results</b> are really good, I mean he was predicted to exceed expected standards or whatever the correct terminology is, but I did expect him to get nearly everything right.</p> <p>Maths 115 SPAG 115 Reading 113</p> <p>Thanks for listening, as you were 🤔. <del>very very proud mum</del></p>	<p>Mother can be viewed negatively for 'showing off' sons academic achievements, but the use of the words 'smug', 'proud' can represent a sense of pride, <b>viewing her positively.</b></p> <p>It is a <b>justifiable</b> behaviour as she is proud of her son but <b>don't think it's in the best interest</b> as he cannot view this online which reiterates the 'showing off' aspect.</p>
T1D2	<p><b>We're in the same position Blip. Dd achieved three scores of 115.</b> Trying to work out next steps, we don't think she is being <b>challenged enough</b> at school.</p> <p><b>Massive congratulations to your DS! :-)</b></p>	<p>Mother is viewed <b>positively for praising other children and trying to ensure the best for her child.</b></p> <p>It is a <b>justifiable</b> behaviour as she feels her daughter isn't being challenged in school <b>and is in the child's best interest</b> to help meet her needs at school.</p>
T1D3	<p>Congratulations to your DC, great scores!</p> <p>I know what you mean, <b>not being challenged is an understatement but I'm not really sure what to do.</b> The thing with the school is that although it has a poor reputation that is mainly historic, the OFSTED wasn't great but it wasn't catastrophic either. But these factors and the fact that it is situated in a council estate is making it very unpopular with the generally middle class populace of our area. This has actually worked to our advantage as class sizes have remained small, <b>with DS standing out</b> (22 in <b>DS's</b> class). Unfortunately they are planning to mix his class with year 4 next year bringing the class size up to 30 <b>of very mixed ability</b> DC. DS loves school and has never complained of</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – No Best interest of the child - No</p>



	being bored, I think if that happens we really will have to consider other options.	
T1D4	Just a consideration with prep/ private route...I would think about your child's competitive side, because it may be best NOT to foster this too much for him emotionally. (I've seen the consequences of this pressure in their teens). If it were me, I would try and challenge him in other ways eg. Karate, creative writing course, drama, music lessons, sports training etc. This will create simulation for him outside school, give him an outlet for competitiveness without it being too purely academic. Push him to be the best he can be, this is what I do with my DS.	Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child - yes
T1D5	Thanks for the advice, DS does do music, swimming and football out of school. I don't want to do so much that he is exhausted by the end of the week.	Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child – yes
T1D6	Thing is, this new sats aren't really helping highly able children to show their true ability, imo. It's a same test for everybody, and don't go beyond what is expected. So if two child scored perfect score, one can be just an above average child, and other can be totally exceptional, but cannot show their true colours. This isnt fair for my ds who can do better than this. But of course I would expect the teacher to determine the difference and hopefully stretch them accordingly.	Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child – yes
T1D7	Hmm, well although I'm not having high expectations for his application for Oxford just yet but I am trying to make sure that my happy, confident little bobstays happy and confident and enjoying school. For me next steps talking to the school about adequate challenges. They have a tendency to be very surprised when he meets their challenges easily which is not helping his growth mindset (they do far to much praising for cleverness and not enough praise for effort).	Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child – yes
T1D8	Well done everyones kiddies!!	Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes

	<p>Very proud of my boy.</p> <p>He's In school that's in special measures that is changing to an academy changing name and uniform!! Those extra, long hours of tutoring paid off!!!!</p> <p>He's pulled it out the bag tho 🤪</p> <p>115 - grammar, punctuation, vocabulary &amp; spelling</p> <p>115 - reading</p> <p>109 – mathematics</p>	Best interest of the child - no
T1D9	<p>My ds hasn't done as well as yours, he doesn't want to learn. Hes very bright though and I want him to get into a good grammar school. I'm going to cut his clubs and get a support from school as they are very good.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child - no</p>
T2D1	<p>I asked for extra maths for our DS, school were not supportive, we ended up getting a maths tutor (who is completely amazing) as a treat. Yesterday with the tutor he did a test at level 7, which I understand to be @ 12/13 year olds. He didn't know what some of the sums were, and he found it a stretch, but he did very well. He is eight.</p> <p>The reason the tutor did this test is because during the summer holiday, between year three and year four, ds was doing the mental maths tests designed for year six, getting 100% and finding it easy. We cover stuff that they haven't done in schools and I am for pushing him.</p> <p>This may be good, he may grow out of it, he may just have a knack. The school do push their pupils, so he isn't allowed to coast. Okay, he does coast, but he's encouraged and it's not too bad.</p> <p>Do I need to do anything? I don't want to let him down, but I don't want him to feel the odd one out. I just want to do the right thing by him, which may be to leave well alone, just keep on with the maths tutor. Am I just being a bit precious?</p> <p>Any advice gratefully received</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – no</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>

T2D2	<p>I think you've just discovered that your son's maths ability is a square peg in the round hole of the education system.</p> <p>You can now decide whether to prepare him for GCSEs or try to broaden his knowledge and keep him engaged, which is a lot more difficult.</p> <p>I don't know the answer to your question. Yes, your son has needs and no, they will not be met by the education system which is geared towards getting him ready to sit his GCSE in year 11. I've got the same problem with my ds (but not as acute), I've been grappling with it for years and I still have not worked out a reasonable solution.</p> <p>By the way, level 7 is considered to be broadly equivalent to a C at GCSE.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – no</p> <p>Best interest of the child - no</p>
T2D3	<p>I think it depends on whether you think there is any benefit in getting to formal milestones earlier or whether you prefer a different approach.</p> <p>The older one (my highly gifted one) is very keen on outside activities so I let her do quite a lot of those, but we don't push any school stuff. Tbh as they get older if they do want to learn something, the Internet will teach them, usually for free.</p> <p>I think with a very gifted child there comes a point where you have to choose between pushing ahead with milestones, or simply accepting that the school programme will probably be unsuited until at least A level or the equivalent. Once you've decided that, you get on with providing stimulation and opportunities (not necessarily academic ones) outside of school - my oldest for example we've pushed her to be a keen musician who's also learnt languages at home. We are planning to add German to her list this year because she can't do it at school. She has plenty of time on her hands because she finds schoolwork very easy.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child - no</p>

T2D4	<p>Maths tutor as a treat? I wouldn't like to see what they get as a punishment! Schools are very supportive if you ask. Allow him to be a child and push him in other areas like sports or music. My dd takes part in many sports.</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child - yes</p>
T2D5	<p>DS2 would have thought doing maths was a treat when he was younger too.</p> <p>He wouldn't now though because he's come to view maths as a bit of a grind, a time to try to overcome feelings of boredom, and I think the OP is right to try to avoid getting into the same situation. Teachers do try to challenge children but they do have 30 children.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – no Best interest of the child - no</p>
T2D6	<p>I agree about early GCSE, but only because being good at maths surely leads into A level, which in turn leads into university. This is what I want for my son. Even if you don't know you want to do a maths degree, you'd at least want the option of deciding that for yourself?</p> <p>The other option is to take a break from learning maths at all (after GCSE, say). I think of being good at something as a talent, and it seems such a waste to just leave it untouched for a couple of years and hope you'll still find it easy when you pick it up again once everyone has caught up.</p> <p>So, then you decide not to do GCSEs early, but that creates a vacuum. Everyone says its such a wide subject, but is it really? I think it is from undergraduate level onwards, but before that, isn't it just arithmetic, word problems, a bit of algebra, some trigonometry and an intro to calculus?</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – no Best interest of the child - no</p>
T2D7	<p>At that age DD would bite my hand off to do some maths, especially any kind of formal test, because she thought it was "so much fun!"</p> <p>She's still roughly the same now aged 12, but DD's home-life is largely filled with a variety of school stuff she also enjoys. Only one part isn't schooling as shes not able to play as part of the school curriculum, a musical instrument, has 2 weekly lessons. I wanted to</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child - no</p>

	<p>give her a break and I always wanted to play an instrument as a child so encouraged her to do so.</p>	
T2D8	<p>If he has had a lot else going on, I would definitely carry on with the tutor, simply because it is giving him pleasure, and also a positive sense of himself. He will stand out in class whatever you do, but at least he won't be bored. He will be the best, which is how I like to think of my son when we pay for his tutor.</p> <p>Have you thought about a chess club as giving him another outlet. And if you have a tablet, there is a great game called DragonBox (in 5+ and 12+ versions, he could probably do one after another) which is simultaneously fun and an intro to algebra. (there's also a geometry one but I don't rate it as much). My DS does lots of learning at home through games.</p> <p>What have the school actually said? Have you shared the test results with them?</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T2D9	<p>The head teacher said he wasn't outstanding. She has never been convinced he is bright. His form tutors are at the sharp end and last year the form teacher apparently checked the internet to confirm that eg, ds did know about certain volcanic rocks that the form teacher hadn't heard of, that he picks stuff up easily etc. (the tutor didn't know that obsidian was volcanic glass. I didn't judge, I can't teach thirty kids. There are other examples)</p> <p>I explained about the test - level seven but skipping the bits he hadn't been taught like algebra and she just didn't believe me. I could try getting it all formal and the tutor writing to the school, but I honestly don't know if it will go against ds - if the head teacher is convinced I am trying to make him look brighter than he is and hot housing him then there is no way she is going to accept that he is getting ahead.</p> <p>They are put in different classes according to</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child - yes</p>

	<p>ability and I am not convinced that the new maths teacher is the encouraging sort either.</p> <p>I suppose it's being a parent - trying to work out what to do for the best when it is all unknown.</p>	
T2D10	<p>Don't worry about the school pushing back and generally implying that you are deluded - its a classic technique and something many of us have experienced from time to time. This was my case with my DS.</p> <p>They do it because its easier to imply that you are the problem, than admit that they are failing your child. If you think about it, if he were to receive a really good education that kept him slightly challenged him most of the time, then he'd need a series of lessons for your son alone.</p> <p>He's like a little sponge and he'll master whatever he gets taught quickly, demonstrate it in 10 different ways and then sit like an excited puppy ready for the next thing. Even teaching him 1-1 would be exhausting because you'd never be able to rest. You'd spend time working out what to offer next, assembling it into an explanation for him and then a series of tasks for him to do, then he'd have finished the lot almost before you get a chance to start thinking what you can offer next.</p> <p>Except teachers have 30 children to look after, some of them need things explained many times before they get it, then there is discipline to be taken care of, registers to be marked, art materials to be prepared, games lessons to be devised, forms to be filled, parents to talk with etc., etc. So, they only have a tiny amount of time to teach your child, and since he's easily meeting every government target the teacher is given, she may not feel too inclined to spend time helping him.</p> <p>Why schools just won't admit that, I don't know. Instead, they prefer to imply the parent is simply wrong about what their child can</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child - yes</p>

	<p>do, and has the capacity to do. They will declare black is white and if you insist that its black, and provide specialist reports to prove it, they will tell you that they don't recognise the qualifications of the report writer, or that the report is biased because you paid for it. Moreover, they will imply in their manner that you are a pushy parent.</p> <p>They will discuss you child's progress in levels to show you he has made progress, until you speak back in levels and then they will suddenly switch tack and tell you that you "too hung up on levels".</p> <p>They will promise vaguely that things will be better soon, or instruct you that they are the professionals and you should leave it to them, or imply you are ruining you child's childhood by hot-housing him (i.e. artificially increasing his ability in specific areas), or they will inform you that you are too focused on the things your child is good at and you shouldn't say another word about them until he is equally good at whatever he has normal ability in.</p> <p>If the school or an individual teacher chooses to see what is under their noses and actually help your child, then rejoice! However, there will be many years when that doesn't happen and I honestly believe that every bit of effort you put into changing their minds, whether by persuasion or obligation, is just a waste of time effort and emotional energy.</p> <p>Its great that your son is very able, but the cost is that you'll have to take care of developing his abilities if you want a rate of progress that is anything other than that which the education system is designed to do. (Personally I suspect the state education system is setup to teach children around the 40th centile and everyone else is expected to just fit in!)</p>	
T2D11	<p>Mental health problems are not that uncommon amongst very able children, I am sorry to say.</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child - yes</p>

	<p>I've had the odd problem with DS1 - mainly centred around perfectionism and the fear of being a freak. DS2 is happy-go-lucky by nature, but even he has been upset sometimes feeling that no matter how hard he tries, how many artificial hoops he jumps through, he can't get the (primary) teacher to set him challenging work.</p> <p>I advocated for Ds2 a lot and got absolutely nowhere. There were 2 primary schools and now both boys are at secondary and things are shaping up the same again - unchallenging work and targets that were passed before they were even set. I want my boys to live a successful live and have all the opportunities I didn't.</p> <p>Its taken me a long time and a lot of heartache to realise that its not me being PFB, its the system saying it will "teach" but not meaning it, and never intending to mean it.</p> <p>So, i know the answer is to let them try at the subjects they don't find easy and give them opportunities to develop themselves at home. However, I am also stretched 100 ways, don't have any time for myself at all, haven't had a night out in years, and still I can only serve up patchy solutions, that don't really answer the issues.</p> <p>I wish I could offer you an answer OP, but I can only tell you to short cut trying to get the school to help and do your best to encourage your DS to find ways to interest himself at home. Plus telling you that you are not alone.</p>	
T2D12	<p>Reading this thread was like being taken back ten years. I experienced grave difficulties with some of my son's primary school teachers not wanting to engage with our concerns about his ability and the reasons why he was becoming more and more unwilling to go to school where he was bored.</p> <p>Our solution may not be for you, but if you can I would suggest applying for a place at</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child - yes</p>



	<p>an academic independent school. Our son got a full scholarship thanks to our determination and consistency and has one more year to go before he finishes. It wasn't a perfect solution because it is a boarding school, but it has made a significant difference to him.</p> <p>The teachers are used to dealing with very bright children and don't see you (as the parent) or them as a nuisance to be got rid of, but rather as a challenge to help in the best way they can. The key difference though is that being clever is seen as normal. All the children are clever and therefore no one gets bullied for being bright. None of them have to cover up being able in order to fit in. So the children learn that it is who you are that matters. We felt that this was really important. Our son is now happy, well-adjusted, engaged and competitive with learning and has friends. I think if we hadn't done this he wouldn't be any of those things.</p> <p>I sympathise with your anxiety. Having a very bright child is not the fun option many people seem to think. It's a huge responsibility. We agonised for months about what to do for the best and in the end realised that it wasn't about us, our politics, our views, our inclinations. It was about what was best for him. I would make the same decision again in a heart beat. Your son doesn't need counselling he needs a school suited to his abilities.</p>	
T3D1	<p>My Ds is in yr1 and the youngest in his class. He is high ability and this was mentioned to me in reception where he received an exceptional school report at the end of the year. He is very able and that is partly because I have worked with him at home reading, writing numbers etc, formally and make this a priority during spare time.</p> <p>My gripe is that I do not feel that his school is challenging or stretching him. When I have mentioned this to the teacher in the past she says he doesn't respond in class as well as she would like. He does for maths because he</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child - yes</p>

	<p>loves maths, but for the other subjects he is not as engaged. She agrees that he knows what he has to do and does it with varying degrees of effort, but she would like to see him as energised as he is for the maths questions. She agrees that in test he gets full marks but some of her assessments are classwork. Ds was home sick for a good week so I asked for some work that he missed so we could cover it at home. She kindly agreed. When I saw what it was - my heart sank! <b>It is work that he can do in 5 minutes</b> and we have covered at home already, and to be honest most of the homework he brings home can be done in 5mins including spellings, which most of the time he already knows how to spell them. I feel that whenever I approach her she is very defensive. I would like <b>Ds to be stretched with more challenging work</b>, which will energise him. He is reading gold / stage 9 but doesn't find them very interesting. Luckily we have a very good children's library and a good collection at home so I'm not worried on that part.</p> <p>I know that children achieve more at home because of 121 / less distractions, She says that at the moment he is working at a 2c maths 1a reading and literacy. We don't have much of a choice for schools as all the "better" state schools in our area are over subscribed. His reception teacher was great, she made him feel very confident with lots of praise, unfortunately his current teacher has a different style of teaching and he doesn't get the praise, even at times he has come home with stories about how the teacher chose him to put the tray of cakes in the oven for cooking - !!?? which wasn't true.</p> <p>So.....should I be concerned that my child doesn't appear to be stretched academically at school, and how do I approach the school again to get them to help him. Or is this the same for many families and I just carry on working at home with him.</p>	
T3D2	Year 1 is about learning how to learn in a group, learning how to sit at tables, wait your	Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes

	<p>turn, work with others, share and generally be able to cooperate.</p> <p>If you want to stretch him sideways at home, go for it but unless he learns to 'perform' for other adults without you around, school is going to be very frustrating for both of you.</p> <p>My DS had a very supportive teacher but didn't want to learn and this was a big problem, but could share well.</p> <p>Do you have other children that he has to share with at home?</p>	Best interest of the child - no
T3D3	<p>No he is an only child... He does do extra curricular activities most nights which so far isn't a problem, he enjoys the engagement from these which he doesn't get at school.</p> <p>Any advice appreciated. Thanks</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child - yes</p>
T3D4	<p>I think it's unfair to expect the school to do what you're doing at home. What it sounds like is you're expecting 1:1 attention for him in terms of differentiated work etc. There should be a group of kids who are intelligent, though perhaps their parents are not coaching them as much so they are not so far ahead. My ds2 is very intelligent and is in a group with other kids like that. They are stretched as a group, but I don't do stuff with him at home (unless asked) as I don't want him to get bored in school and turned off school - or to be the 'smart Alec' (who likes one of them?).</p> <p>The more you do at home, the more he will be behind at school. Maybe you're stretching him too much outside of school?</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T3D5	<p>If you're working with him at home "both formally and informally", I think you're going to be disappointed in the academical challenge of any school.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child - yes</p>
T3D6	<p>Have you thought that actually you child might be quite difficult at school and doesn't show his ability fully. This is what happened to my ds. It turned out he was the problem, his behaviour. Working at home one to one if far easier than having to deal with a class of 25 or 30. You child may also find working</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child - no</p>

	<p>one to one is easier as in class there are lots of distractions.</p> <p>If you are not getting the answers "you" want from his teacher and genuinely think something needs to change then your only other course of action is to speak to the head teacher. This may or may not work and could possibly have a detrimental effect on your parent teacher relationship.</p> <p>If you are very unhappy then vote with your feet and move though you may find the new school is no better.</p>	
T3D7	<p>My DS isn't being challenged by his school and his teachers are rubbish. I've complained numerous time and nothing has happened. He is very bright and able and ive had to taken his future into my hands.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child - no</p>
T3D8	<p>Tbh I only think it's an issue if your DS is unhappy with the level of work and tuning out. A teacher can only assess what she sees and needs evidence (ie work that he has done) to level him.</p> <p>DD is in yr1 and is in a very high ability year group (think 2As and 3Cs around now) and she is definitely getting enough of the academic stuff as well as having fun. Her teacher has twigged that she (DD) starts messing, misbehaving and showing off (this only happens if work is too easy for a long period ie a week, not the odd 30 min lesson). I am working alongside the teacher to try to motivate my frustrated child.</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child - yes</p>
T3D9	<p>if a Yr1 child was receiving private tuition I would feel sorry for them, if they are doing a lot of formal work at home I feel sorry for them. Family situation makes no difference.</p> <p>DD1 is in Yr1 and very bright, she finds all the work at school easy but she apparently gets everything right, produces very good work and is very engaged in the classroom as well as helpful and so on. She spends her</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – no Best interest of the child -no</p>

	time out of school doing sports, drama, dancing, swimming and social activities and I want her to start an instrument. I don't want her to get too comfortable coating, If she loose interest in her education how will she go to university and establish a career?	
T3D10	Why not just pull him out and home ed? It sounds like you just want your child to stand out. That's not fair on him or the school. Let him be a child or let the school do their job. My ds is receiving the best support.	Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child - yes
T3D11	Some parents want what is best for their child. I want my DS to be challenged academically, take part in as many sports as possible, go to university, have a good job. Why shouldn't we do this for our children?	Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -no
T3D12	This is ridiculous, we blame our education too much poor teachers. My DDs teacher is amazing and I support her more at home but she is bored and wants to do 'fun' thingd, but I feel her education is more important and I want to help teachers.	Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -no
T3D13	I agree. It sounds like he isn't doing the work given to a high standard. Maybe you need to encourage him to try harder at school? We always blame the teacher when maybe we should look at ourselves or our children. My DS was the problem, not the teacher.	Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child - yes
T3D14	Children with talents should be shown off like my ds, I always brag about his gifts as the school don't recognise them! They give him the wrong grades and undermine his ability. They will regret it when he becomes the next famous mathematician :L	Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – no Best interest of the child -no
T4D1	Academically or otherwise child is 5 years old and is always at the bottom of everything child tries (dance/sport, reading & maths etc.) Of course I love my child but just wish he would shine in something. Am I alone?  I must mention that I never let my feelings show. Child always cries when coming last in a race game with friends. I tell child that winning is not everything and to remember to have fun. I don't think it is so much about me actually. Child always wants to win in	Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child - no

	<p>everything but never good enough. Breaks my heart. For child's sake I hope we find something that child will truly enjoy and maybe does not involve comparing self with peers. Child will be joining musical theatre soon as he enjoys singing and drama.</p> <p>Any words of wisdom?</p> <p>Please be kind.</p>	
T4D2	<p>tell him what you expect of him and reward him for this. This works well with my DS. I make him more academic and motivate him to learn as the school doesn't challenge him. this will help him in years to come.</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child –yes</p>
T4D3	<p>Is school any help? My school is awful so I hired a tutor for my child and he is now excelling and way above other children.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child - no</p>
T4D4	<p>Your child will shine in something. But he is only little and he hasn't had enough time to find that thing yet.</p> <p>encourage lots of sports, this will rise his competitiveness and confidence which will reflect in school also, which they fail to promote anymore. The best thing I did for my DS was make him attend football.</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T4D5	<p>You know, I totally understand where you are coming from, dd 7 has ASD and developmental delays, and it breaks my heart that she is not like her NT peers and that ds 2.7 years, whilst a happy and sunny little boy, is delayed in speech and language and some other areas. It makes me sad that his peers are chattering away and he is still talking in baby language or not communicating at all at pre school. Why can't my kids be like other kids. Of course I don't let that show to them and praise them always.</p> <p>You know what, your child is only 5, not fully developed yet, and probably is a late bloomer, will show his passions and interests later on. I had developmental delays when I was that age, not good in anything really, but</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child - no</p>

	<p>I have a good BA (hons) in Psychology and MSC too and have got various hobbies which I enjoy. Enjoy your child, and he might surprise you with a degree when hes older!</p>	
T4D6	<p>This is the same with my DS. No one in school or at clubs ever praises him and he holds back.</p> <p>He is rather shy though and probably that is what is holding him back also. I will give an example. At the tennis lessons coach kept giving instructions but he couldn't exactly follow. Coach ended up using that slow patronising tone when speaking to child. Broke my heart. Pulled him out of those lessons so looking for a different class as he insists on keeping in with the lessons. I want him to do many clubs like I did and this will help him with his confidence and academically also.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – no Best interest of the child - no</p>
T4D7	<p>I do hear where you are coming from. My DD1 is spectacularly unsporty, borderline dyspraxic. Hurts herself a fair bit, never catches the ball, took ages to learn to ride a bike, knows how to swim but hates it and only swims under sufferance, you get the picture. Always pushed her to attend clubs and hired a tutor for her dyspraxia. I do not think schools promote children's talents in all areas either.</p> <p>When I see other kids zooming about on scooters and climbing trees and arguing with their big brothers to have a go on their big bikes, kids just "taking" to roller skating or gymnastics without any help or teaching, I do feel a bit sad and disappointed for her. Seems like she is missing out on a lot of fun of childhood, but it's just not her thing.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – no Best interest of the child -no</p>
T4D8	<p>Push for loads of clubs and music to get him out of his shell, otherwise they will fall into the background, especially at school. My child benefited from this and I see her studying music at university.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes</p>



T4D9	<p>You need to teach him/her that it's okay to come last or take a lot of time to learn something. This is what schools don't teach our children.</p> <p>Why don't you take up a new instrument or sport with him and show them that it's normal to be crap to begin with!</p> <p>I took me months to find what my child is good at, and now hes found his stide there is no stoppinghim.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -no</p>
T4D10	<p>I am guilty of dwelling on the negatives too when it comes to my ds who is not really great at anything!.</p> <p>So say something positive about your offspring (boasting encouraged), it will make you feel better</p> <p>Ds is the best because he knows all about the feeding habits of basking sharks. And he is only 3. Wonder what he will learn in school haha.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child - no</p>
T4D11	<p>my ds (aged 6.5) is the best because when he's practising and competing in his tennis serve and misses the ball he mutters in a frustrated tone "oh come on". He'll be the next Andy Murray! He loves doing tennis at school also and we encourage him to win, we are a naturally competitive family anyway</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T4D12	<p>dd is the best because... she's just learnt to play my life goal of the violin. We have practiced every night for months now and she is about to do her grade 1...I'm more nervous that her... Hope she passes or the music teacher will be getting a call haha!!</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – no</p> <p>Best interest of the child -no</p>
T4D13	<p>Ds1 is the best(!) because he always works so hard at school and gets brilliant results! He really enjoys his tutor and the school are proud of him as well.</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>



T5D1	<p>OK, we are not a musical family, but I have encouraged kids to learn an instrument. dd2 is learning clarinet, she is 9, year 4 and has been learning for about a year. She is very conscientious and practices for 30 minutes every single morning, but is making slow progress.</p> <p>I used to play the clarinet 30 years ago, only to grade 3 level, but I do play other things and currently play in the training part of a brass band with dd1, I only say this to show I can read music etc, but not to a high level.</p> <p>dd1 has her clarinet Prep test tomorrow. At her last lesson, the teacher told her she wasn't ready and didn't know the pieces well enough. She has practised and practised and I can't see how she can play them any better really, she isn't always note perfect, and she sometimes gets the timing a bit off, but they are fine, and I am sure good enough to pass. On a good day, they are perfect, with good dynamics and sound great, so she can do it on a good day, just not every time.</p> <p>One piece is supposed to have a piano accompaniment. There is no piano at school. We live round corner from school and have a piano, but it needs tuning. Teacher has failed to make any suggestions or arrangements for her to practice this with a piano. I am willing to take her to the Music Centre etc and teacher knows this. Her final suggestion is that she comes to the exam early tomorrow and they will practice the piece with the piano then. I am pretty sure this will be a bad experience for dd as she won't get it first time and it will dent her confidence for the exam.</p> <p>Then this morning, I noticed in the back of the Prep test book, it says the examiner will play these games with her, clap and repeat rhythms, beat time to a piece of music, play 3 notes and sing them back, and comment on dynamics of a piece. I asked dd if she had practiced these with teacher. No.</p> <p>I tried one or two with her. She hasn't a clue, can't sing the notes back, can't beat time. She</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child - yes</p>
------	---	--

	<p>can repeat the clapped rythmn as they do it at school.</p> <p>I am so cross. She could have learnt these. If I had realised earlier I could even have done them with her. She needs to be taught them, she obvioulsy isn't a natural musician, but she loves playing her clarinet and I wanted this to be a positive experience for her. Never mind that it has cost enough to enter her for it!</p> <p>Is this my fault? dd's fault? Teacher's fault?</p> <p>I am I just being precious considering that this exam isn't marked anyway? None of this is helped by the fact that dh will take her to the exam, so he will need to talk to the teacher, not me.</p>	
T5D2	<p>Sounds like a crap music teacher - we have had these. Is it an ABRSM exam? If so, you can usually download practice tests and piano accompaniments from their website.</p> <p>I think the more important issue here is whether your daughter is enjoying playing the clarinet, or whether she is doing it because you want her to?</p> <p>I only ask this, as I fell into the 'I played a musical instrument, so my children will too' trap. DS1 loved it, was naturally talented, and has progressed to Grade 8 with ease and plays in numerous bands/ groups etc. DS2 hated his first instrument, so we swapped to another. Hated that, so we swapped teacher. He was making painfully slow progress and eventually I just said to the teacher 'I think this is a waste of time and he doesn't even enjoy it'. Huge sigh of relief all round.</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T5D3	<p>I had the same issue with my DD and I blamed both the teacher and my daughter for not practising enough. Although my daughter isn't bright academically we encouraged her to play an instrument to ensure some sort of talent and shes not engaged...her fault!</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – no</p> <p>Best interest of the child -no</p>
T5D4	<p>Yes, you should be annoyed with the teacher if she really hasn't practised the Listening Games. That's tough on the kid because if</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – no</p> <p>Best interest of the child – no</p>

	<p>you hadn't seen them she would have been really thrown in the deep end.</p> <p>My DD wasn't making much progress in her music, we blamed the teacher until DD turned around and said she didn't enjoy it and said we were making her do it. Check your DD is enjoying the lessons.</p>	
T5D5	<p>Who entered her for the exam? Because if it was the teacher i would be very cross with them for essentially setting her up for failure (you <i>can</i> fail Trinity prep test!).</p> <p>My DS nearly failed his- entirely his fault, lack of preparation and practice, teacher had done everything needed. Very embarrassing as all children passed with flying colours.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – no</p> <p>Best interest of the child -no</p>
T5D6	<p>I had exactly this problem with dd's Grade 1 piano exam.</p> <p>I have a music degree &amp; dh is a music teacher and wanted dd to follow in our footsteps, but we left dd's teacher to it as we didn't want to be interfering. Then we realised just before her exam she'd not done any aural or sightreading &amp; had only just started her third piece. In fact she wasn't reading the music at all she had memorised the patterns (I'd taught her for 12 months prior to her starting proper lessons &amp; her sight reading was fine/level appropriate back then)</p> <p>So you have every right to be cross.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child - yes</p>
T6D1	<p>I went to a prep school where every child's strength was encouraged - whether one's strength was academic, sporting, musical, art, drama etc, it was found and nurtured.</p> <p>My children's school does non competitive sports day, which I think is ridiculous and in addition is unfair on those children that excel at sport - when do they get to shine or have their potential realised? (This is because my children DD are fantastic at sport btw).</p> <p>(And for those who are going to say if you don't like it, move to the private sector - if</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child – yes</p>

	you'd like to pay my four sets of fees, then I'd be eternally grateful 😊)	
T6D2	Another in agreement here - my DD's state schol does this and yet they don't think twice about singling out the most talented children in other realms - music, art, drama who then get chosen for every prize and other children don't get a look-in. Seems totally inconsistent that children aren't allowed to excel at sports! My dd is excellent at sport and I want to show her off as she isn't very academic.	Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child - yes
T6D3	Our school is a state school and we have competitive sports. But parents can be over-competitive and shouting at their children, putting lots of pressure, id prefer a non competitive sports day for my dd.	Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes
T6D4	Surely school sport is about fitness for life rather than athletic prowess. There are plenty of opportunities for competitive sport through clubs outside school.  In a non competitive sports day the children get to compete in loads of activities rather than sitting on the sidelines being bored witless and waiting for their one race. They are in teams so there is an element of competition. The children loved it and perhaps that's the main thing. My DS isn't good at sport and instead of extreme competitiveness he gets to enjoy sports with his friends.	Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes
T6D5	I agree with you too. We have a silly system where the children go round the school field in their teams taking it in turns at the 'sports' in various places and the scores are all added up at the end. I want my child (DD) to strive, win and achieve. We don't pay for athletic club for nothing!!	Mother viewed negative Justifiable behaviour – no Best interest of the child – yes
T6D6	Really tired that argument can be used to justify anything for example would you be happy your child won the spelling contest when there are dyslexic children in your class. By refusing only competitive sports they are pushing those who are good at sports (mine DS's are not BTW) out but letting every other area be great at something.	Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes

T6D7	<p>I dont understand this non competitive stuff either - we try and make them competitive with SATS - they are encouraged to be the best but when it comes to sports - no we have to be all nice and say everyone is a winner</p> <p>Which is why our country is crap at sports</p> <p>My dd is excellent at sport and I push her to be the best. would be nice to see her win at a sports day</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child - yes</p>
T6D8	<p>dd1 is in yr3, didn't win anything and couldn't even remember what her 2 stickers were for</p> <p>she has always been about the taking part and the fun 😊</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – no</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T6D9	<p>They have PE lessons don't they - where they run around and learn about fitness etc and I think it would be possible to have competitive races running concurrently.</p> <p>I am in agreement with thirtysomething - they recognise the talents of the children in every other arena but the sporting one, which discriminates against those whose one specialty may be sport, like my DD.</p> <p>Of course I'm 'proud' that my child can run faster than other children; the argument is surely that if a school recognises talent in other arenas, it is unfair not to do so in the sporting one - many children don't do after school clubs.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T7D1	<p>I was told today I was a pushy parent because my DS has a tutor at weekend (as school doesn't meet his needs) and he plays football Saturday morning and Rugby Sunday morning. Although my husband takes him to the sport and has encouraged him to do this and I feel he needs a tutor, he is happy to take part in these activities.</p> <p>We only want the best for our child to succeed in life.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child – yes</p>

T7D2	<p>My DD does cello and piano - some consider might consider this pushy(two instruments and she is 9) We are not very musical and me or my DH cant read a musical note to save out lives. She started piano as her best friend started doing this at school and took up cello as that was the other instrument her music teacher loved(listened to this on you tube). Making good progress in both and infact we are surprised with her ability . We do support her by taking her to concerts(although I dont understand and would rather spend time on somewhere else) and make sure she does her practise fairly regularly.</p> <p>You need to expose them to various thing and you might find that there might be something they might be good at (music,dance,sport).My view is she will a hobby (or a profession) when she growps and will enjoy it for the rest of her life.</p> <p>What is preceived as pushiness from outside is propably not.</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T7D3	<p>I get accused of doing that with ds who is 7.</p> <p>He is at drama/dance/singing/guitar etc every night (although is home ed so is not like knackered after school).</p> <p>He does plays, auditions etc. Although I support him, I limit the amount of auditions I allow him to go to, as he needs to focus on his schooling. I see loads of pushy parents at auditions and castings, I feel for some of those kids. My ds doesn't give a monkeys if he doesn't get a part in something, he just says 'oh well, maybe next time' and moves on.</p> <p>Thing is, he is good at what he enjoys. I couldn't stop him doing the things he loves.</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T7D4	<p>Hmmm. I suspect I'm guilty of pushing DD to try things she isn't keen on (music, sport) as well as the nice safe familiar things she'd prefer to spend all her time on</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – no Best interest of the child -no</p>

	(drawing, reading). The odd thing is, DD is probably a lot more talented (certainly in music) than she thinks, just much less confident and keen.	
T7D5	<p>My DD who is in Reception goes to French, piano and swimming after school classes. She does French because she asked to do, piano because I play it and swimming because I think it is an important life skill. She loves both.</p> <p>I have begun to look at Kumon maths - but thought I would hold out until DD is a bit older old. Parents in my class have been talking about arranging tutors for the 11+, which I support as I know the teachers in the upper school are not very good.</p> <p>Although, I don't want to push her, we hope she will go to the local independent secondary school and I worry that she won't be able to compete because she has 'just' had a normal education to that point without all the extras and tutors etc.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – no</p> <p>Best interest of the child -no</p>
T7D6	I have a tutor for my DS and he's in Y1, nothing wrong with giving him extra support that the school cant do with large classes. He also does swimming, football and karate and is the best in his classes.	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -no</p>
T7D7	We encourage my child to compete to achieve and he enjoys it as the school in KS1 do not do any competitive sports. Therefore my son does a lot outside of school.	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T8D1	DS is in year 1, just turned 6, and he is very good at maths. I could give numerous examples, but I don't want to boast so you will have to take my word for it. He is very good at understanding maths concepts (percentages, fractions), spotting patterns, adding/subtracting in his head (he can add three, three digit numbers), measuring and comparing distances, map reading, etc etc. I spoke to his teacher a couple of times about this since he started year 1 and raised it at parents evenings, but all she said is to write down any extra work we do at home in his	<p>Mother viewed positively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>



	<p>work book. Trouble is, she doesn't seem to adapt any work at all to his capability. I don't want to make a fuss over it and I am happy to support his learning at home, but would appreciate if other parents could tell me how it works at their school/classes. Will it just come later on when he is older? Or not at all? Thank you!</p>	
T8D2	<p>I think that is probably a very school specific question. In my case, dd1's actual capabilities have only been realised in yr3 where the work has become very differentiated. In Yrs 1 and 2, as long as they were likely to hit their level 3 target they didn't push them any further. Dd2 is yr1 and not being stretched in any way in maths - although having said that, she is not as able as your ds - but she can do all that is required of her at the moment.</p> <p>In my opinion, unless you want him to be taking GCSE at 11 yrs old, there is no rush. Let him keep enjoying maths and finding it easy - one less thing to worry about!</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour –yes Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T8D3	<p>Noticed a bit in year 1, dismissed in year 2, nothing beyond expected in Year 3. Year 4 whoa, she's just completed the year 6 syllabus described as exceptionally gifted and is scoring well on level 6 SATs paper.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour –yes Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T8D4	<p>Y3. We had no idea that what he could do was unusual until his Y3 teacher spotted his ability and gave him the chance to push on</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T8D5	<p>I was very good at maths from a young age. I went to Oxford to read maths. I didn't do anything different at primary school, just found maths easy,</p> <p>All my dc are good at maths.</p> <p>Ds is year 1, not 6yo yet. His current fad is solving algebraic equations using excel. We were discussing even numbers being <math>2n</math>, and odd numbers being <math>2n - 1</math> (<math>n</math> being positive integer) last night. The teacher said she found him very funny last term because she was getting the form to count up in 2s, 3s, 5s and 10s, and he stood up and announced he was going to count in 7 millions. And promptly</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes</p>



	<p>did so.</p> <p>None of them have done anything different from the top groups in school, except dd1 who's had a couple of maths extension days. Neither of the others are old enough for that yet. Once they reach juniors the top set is very much extended (large school) but they've all been picked out as good from the beginning at preschool. The school don't do anything massively different with them. Just we discuss things at home, often more investigative things.</p> <p>They all enjoy maths work books-are as likely to pick them up as anything else fun to do at home. Soemetimes if they talk about what they're doing at school, I'll offer them some extension stuff at home. Tonight we have an hour waiting in the car, they'll take each a ds, a book to read, and a game, but they will probably all end up at some point absorbed in a maths workbook.</p>	
T8D6	<p>DS1 - in Reception I was told he enjoyed number work. In year 1 he was already being given extension work in top set. He's now year 4 and is working with the top half of year 6. It took a lot of pushing to get him recognised.</p> <p>Mind you, he's in a bright class, with two peers at same level so the school restructured sets for them.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T8D7	<p>Reception/KS1 they commented on DS' maths ability. But, as he was already a L3 at the end of y1 they just let him coast during y2. Now he's in y3 and is doing L5 maths thanks to his amazing teacher. Like another poster though, I didn't realise that the things he could do weren't 'normal'</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T8D8	<p>DS is in year 1 and is talented at maths. His capability isn't being acknowledged, let alone differentiated for.</p> <p>I know why. He has the CONCEPTS. But is is absolutely essential that there are no gaps in the LANGUAGE.</p> <p>So he can add 4 or 5 3 diget numbers in his</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>

	<p>head, can convert metric into imperial, can work out basic probability and fractions, can tell the time and knows that 3:17 comes before 4:05, and understands what an hour before 2'oclock would be. However, he could not tell you what an hour EARLIER than 2'oclock would be.</p> <p>It is absolutely essential in the early years that the gaps are filled as poor foundations are very difficult to fill later.</p>	
T8D9	<p>Was picked up in Reception, they 'did something about it' in Y1 - put on the G&amp;T register, joined an inter-school maths club, which he still goes to in Y3. They don't do much more than that tbh.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – no Best interest of the child -no</p>
T8D10	<p>DS was spotted for his maths ability in Reception and has been given harder work since. How far he has been stretched has depended on the class teachers.</p> <p>DS has been awarded a Maths Scholarship and Y3 DS is now capable of doing the typical Y6 homework. They do maths for 'fun' at home 😊</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – no Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T8D11	<p>Ds1 got differentiated work from mid y1 but didn't really get stretched until one day in y2 he had to write spelling sentences with shapes in and he wrote pythagorus' rule and the formulae for calculating the area of circles, squares and triangles. He now gets more extension work. Ds2 is in y1 and can't consistently write his numbers the right way round. He is certainly as good as ds1 but can't yet express it. He has been given a y2 sats test at school and got full marks so they are differentiating a bit and will do so even more in y2.</p> <p>DeWe we may have been at Oxford together. Did you do the 4-year maths course? I did, 95 matriculation.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T8D12	<p>DS was spotted in nursery (attached to school) because he could add and subtract three figure numbers and knew his times tables. He did numeracy from y1 with y3 and</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes</p>

	<p>from y3 with y6. He completed SATs papers in twenty minutes got 100% and school had help from the secondary school from y5. I treasure a certificate he got saying "for loving maths so much and producing so much work we can't keep up with the marking"</p> <p>He was never bored, he'd just explore and push his knowledge further and further so by the time he was in year seven he won the whole school maths challenge beating boys five years older than himself.</p>	
T8D13	<p>DD was finally spotted at year 2 after constant nagging. However I'm inclined to think it's because I was a maths teacher and DH a scientist so we are a numerate household. I so think she's particularly gifted, but also lucky in her surroundings.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T8D14	<p>DS1 is in year 2 and was 'spotted' this year. He is in a very bright class, but still has his own work. He was always good at maths but only really recognised by the teacher this year (probably because the teacher LOVES maths too!) I tried to bring it up in previous years but think I was dismissed a bit as a pushy parent tbh. The main focus this year has been to get him really fast and accurate with tables, mental arithmetic etc. rather than lots of new concepts and it has worked really well. I'm a bit worried about what happens next year though - so would be interested what happened to older dc</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T8D15	<p>DS is naturally good at maths (but he doesn't sound as talented as some on here). His preschool noticed and asked me if I knew, they told school. He is in year 1 now and in the top set but given nothing extra. He has been taken out this week to do some kind of maths test, not sure what that is about though. I think maths is given a very low priority in infant school. I am happy with the approach taken though because he has difficulties in some other areas and I'd rather he focus on those at the moment.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T8D16	<p>Working with numbers to 100 in reception, Y1 but moved school in y2 and put in bottom set, perhaps a bit quiet in his new class, not</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child - yes</p>

	<p>showing what he could do? Anyway I was shocked and said something to the effect that this must be a truly amazing class, put it on a bit. But it worked. Within a week in the top set, L6 SAT last year. Interestingly not so great at English, 5c now at end of y7, but never placed in the wrong set at any point! I know another child who scraped a L3 at the end of year 2, getting his mark through the sums rather than the worded questions iyswim. Perhaps you could ask the teacher about whether your DC is similar? Good luck!</p>	
T8D17	<p>DD's maths was never spotted at school. I now home educate. IME I would say as well as teaching maths concepts it is equally important to encourage children to think how to solve problems for themselves.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -no</p>
T8D18	<p>My ds is still in reception and is doing things like multiplying 2 digit numbers.. He was spotted at the beginning of the year by his fabulous teacher and she tries to differentiate. I don't know if we should be doing more at home but at the moment he's content doing maths problems before bed (and giving me some to do as well!) His mental calculation speed isn't far off mine really. I am not amazing at maths ('b' grade at gcse) but he is only just 5. With other topics he is bright but not exceptional. I don't know what to do with him really!</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T8D19	<p>DS is sitting H Maths as I type, thanks to the schools and mine persistent nature. 😊 DS is not interested.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – yes Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T8D20	<p>DS is faster in maths than I am. I'm pretty good at the mensa maths questions (its all patterns really) and he is quicker (in his head) at doing them than me and his dad. He's 8!</p> <p>School just says he's really really good at maths, isn't he?.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively Justifiable behaviour – no Best interest of the child -yes</p>

T9D1	<p>I ask because some of the children at the boys' school seem to be signed up for <b>everything</b>. Football, tennis, chess, 'Mindlab' (a strategy games class,) choir....the list goes on.</p> <p>Both Mr Bubble and I are fairly musical. Him with the piano and me with the flute (when I have time.) DS1 tried the choir, but didn't like the teacher and plays in the recorder group. He is doing really well with the recorder and visibly enjoys playing in the school assemblies which we've been invited to. He wanted to give up playing this term and I talked him into staying. I felt bad about this at the time and wondered whether I was right to do so.</p> <p>DS2 has joined the weekly football class, and both of them go to 'Mindlab' once a week.</p> <p>I don't want to force them to do anything they're not enjoying, but equally, I think that if I don't persuade them, they'll do nothing.</p> <p>Do you think the children doing lots of after school activities really want to? Or is it pushy mums like me putting pressure on them?</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -no</p>
T9D2	<p>I've got a friend (yes, really!) whose 7 year old DS does:</p> <p>Monday- Kumon maths</p> <p>Tuesday- Beavers</p> <p>Wednesday- Tennis</p> <p>Thursday- French</p> <p>Friday- Football</p> <p>All as after school activities that are not provided by the school. On Saturday morning he goes to a drama club and on Sunday the whole family usually go swimming. She's asked me in the past if he's 'over committed' and I've had to reply honestly, 'yes.' She says</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – no</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>

	he enjoys meeting new people and trying different things.	
T9D3	<p>DD's school limits the number of after-school clubs (taken at school) to two per week. In addition to these (for DD it's IT and Beavers), DD also does piano and dance outside school, which she is brilliant at.</p> <p>The academically selective primary school doesn't do after school clubs. Most of the children are ferried around to activities by parents though.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T9D4	<p>I think it depends on the child, some thrive on activities and perhaps don't have children nearby to play with. Some prefer to play on their own and some in the garden with their friends. DS 8yrs has beavers, gymnastics, orienteering and a nature/ history club. DD5 yrs has dancing, orienteering and gymnastics and will soon start the nature club too, I'm also looking at a drama club for her. They enjoy their clubs (the school ones are not as good but they are free!) and I want to encourage them to do a wide range of things and experience as much as possible. Some of their friends don't go to anything and never venture out of the village.</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T9D5	<p>I am beginning to think Dd1 (7) isn't taking on a too much as she is now doing Choir on a Monday, Brownies on a Wednesday and then Ballet on a Saturday morning.</p> <p>Maybe I should do more after school clubs at school as they are good.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – no</p> <p>Best interest of the child -no</p>
T9D6	<p>when dd was 6/7 she tried out lots of different classes/activities. i wanted to see what would stick, so i pushed her to do a selection of stuff- violin, swimming, tennis, gymnastics, trampoline, drama, ballet, tap, the list goes on. on average she did about three things a week. However as she has got older she has chosen what she enjoys most and i am really glad i gave her a chance to try out a whole raft of stuff. She now does drama( 1 hour)on Wednesday followed by Brownies ( 2hours). then has violin on a Thursday night(</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>

	<p>1/2 an hour). She has chosen herself to keep these up and as she is in the choir in school and plays tennis regularly with her grandpa, I think that it is enough. I do think every child should learn to swim and that is the only thing I ever insisted on. but she can swim ok now and we gave classes up. She is 10 now and has enough on her plate when you add in an hours homework 3 nights a week, I wish the school work stayed in school.</p>	
T9D7	<p>My DS (6 in November) currently does 2 extra curricular things. Swimming (because we think it is a vital life skill - he can give it up if he wants when he is a confident swimmer) and Football (because we believe that sport ... and developing a liking for it ... is a healthy thing to do)</p> <p>Next year he will start piano lessons (because he wants to and seems to be musical)</p> <p>I think extra curricular activities do give children the chance to develop all round skills at things ...</p> <p>Sport is a great thing to get your child into and schools do not have enough time to do this with the curriculum.</p> <p>Sports keep kids healthy and also as they grow up they develop socially around team and club sports (DH and I met at his cricket club for example and all of his friends are from the cricket club he joined at 14).</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T9D8	<p>DS is brilliant at sport but because he is in KS1 they don't offer ANY sport in school. We push him with clubs outside of school to support all of our love of sports and to offer him opportunities the school don't.</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -yes</p>
T9D9	<p>I want to give my children the same opportunities my parents gave me. Lots of clubs and sports. We do this privately as they are specifically trained in these clubs, not like school where they have to offer clubs. We attend matches and competitions regularly and DS enjoys its.</p>	<p>Mother viewed positively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child – yes</p>
T9D10	<p>I've made the decision to push my child academically and with clubs. I want him to have the best opportunities and school</p>	<p>Mother viewed negatively</p> <p>Justifiable behaviour – yes</p> <p>Best interest of the child -no</p>

	supports this.. He has a tutor, who he doesn't like, goes to a G&T club, chess, dodgeball and plays the clarinet	
--	--	--

Male	
Female	
Academic achievements	
Extra-curricular activities	
Competitiveness	
High expectations	
Positive child	
Negative child	
Positive educator	
Negative educator	
Positive Mother	
Negative Mother	
Best interest	
Justifiable behaviour	



**Appendix B**

Discussion	Gender DD, DS or NS	Parents making academic decisions	Interfering with extra-curricular activities	Competitiveness	Having high, but developmentally inappropriate expectations	Negative Child	Positive Child	Negative Educator	Positive Educator	Positive Mother	Negative Mother	In the child's best interest	Justifiable behaviour
T1D1	DS	YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES			YES
T1D2	DD	YES		YES			YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T1D3	DS	YES					YES	YES			YES		
T1D4	DS	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T1D5	DS	YES	YES		YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T1D6	DS	YES		YES			YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T1D7	DS	YES			YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T1D8	DS	YES		YES			YES	YES		YES			YES
T1D9	DS	YES				YES			YES		YES		YES
T2D1	DS	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	
T2D2	DS	YES			YES		YES	YES			YES		
T2D3	DD	YES	YES		YES		YES	YES			YES		YES
T2D4	DD		YES				YES		YES	YES		YES	YES
T2D5	DS	YES				YES			YES		YES		
T2D6	DS	YES			YES		YES	YES			YES		
T2D7	DD	YES	YES				YES	YES			YES		YES
T2D8	DS	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T2D9	DS	YES		YES	YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T2D10	DS	YES					YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T2D11	DS	YES			YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T2D12	DS	YES		YES			YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T3D1	DS	YES			YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T3D2	DS					YES			YES		YES		YES
T3D3	DS		YES				YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T3D4	DS	YES		YES			YES		YES	YES		YES	YES

T3D5	NS	YES						YES			YES	YES	YES
T3D6	DS	YES				YES			YES		YES		YES
T3D7	DS	YES			YES		YES	YES			YES		YES
T3D8	DD	YES				YES			YES	YES		YES	YES
T3D9	DD	YES	YES		YES	YES			YES		YES		
T3D10	DS	YES		YES			YES		YES	YES		YES	YES
T3D11	DS	YES	YES		YES		YES	YES			YES		YES
T3D12	DD	YES	YES		YES	YES			YES	YES			YES
T3D13	DS					YES			YES		YES	YES	YES
T3D14	DS	YES		YES	YES		YES	YES			YES		
T4D1	DS		YES			YES		YES			YES		YES
T4D2	DS	YES			YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T4D3	DS	YES					YES	YES			YES		YES
T4D4	DS	YES	YES	YES			YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T4D5	DD			YES	YES	YES					YES		YES
T4D6	DS	YES	YES			YES		YES			YES		
T4D7	DD	YES	YES	YES		YES		YES			YES		
T4D8	DD	YES	YES		YES		YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T4D9	DS		YES		YES		YES	YES			YES		YES
T4D10	DS			YES		YES		YES			YES		YES
T4D11	DS		YES	YES	YES		YES		YES	YES		YES	YES
T4D12	DD		YES		YES		YES	YES			YES		
T4D13	DS	YES		YES			YES		YES	YES		YES	YES
T5D1	DD	YES	YES		YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T5D2	DS	YES			YES	YES		YES		YES		YES	YES
T5D3	DD		YES		YES	YES		YES			YES		
T5D4	DD	YES	YES		YES	YES		YES			YES		
T5D5	DS			YES	YES	YES			YES		YES		
T5D6	DD		YES		YES	YES		YES			YES	YES	YES
T6D1	DD		YES	YES			YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T6D2	DD		YES	YES			YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T6D3	DD			YES			YES		YES	YES		YES	YES
T6D4	DS		YES				YES		YES	YES		YES	YES
T6D5	DD		YES	YES	YES		YES	YES			YES	YES	

T6D6	DS			YES			YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T6D7	DD			YES	YES		YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T6D8	DD						YES		YES	YES		YES	
T6D9	DD			YES			YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T7D1	DS	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T7D2	DD		YES	YES	YES		YES			YES		YES	YES
T7D3	DS	YES	YES				YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T7D4	DD		YES				YES				YES		
T7D5	DD	YES	YES		YES		YES	YES			YES		
T7D6	DS	YES	YES	YES			YES	YES			YES		YES
T7D7	DS		YES	YES			YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T8D1	DS	YES			YES		YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T8D2	DD	YES		YES	YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T8D3	DD	YES		YES	YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T8D4	DS	YES					YES		YES	YES		YES	YES
T8D5	DS	YES		YES	YES		YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T8D6	DS	YES		YES			YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T8D7	DS	YES		YES	YES		YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T8D8	DS	YES		YES			YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T8D9	DS	YES	YES				YES	YES			YES		
T8D10	DS	YES		YES			YES	YES			YES	YES	
T8D11	DS	YES		YES	YES		YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T8D12	DS	YES		YES			YES		YES	YES		YES	YES
T8D13	DD	YES		YES	YES		YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T8D14	DS	YES			YES		YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T8D15	DS	YES		YES			YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T8D16	DS	YES		YES		YES		YES			YES	YES	YES
T8D17	DD	YES					YES	YES			YES		YES
T8D18	DS	YES		YES	YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T8D19	DS			YES	YES	YES			YES		YES	YES	YES
T8D20	DS	YES		YES			YES	YES			YES	YES	
T9D1	DS	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES			YES		YES
T9D2	DS		YES		YES		YES	YES			YES	YES	
T9D3	DD		YES				YES	YES			YES	YES	YES

T9D4	DS	YES	YES		YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T9D5	DD		YES		YES	YES			YES		YES		
T9D6	DD	YES	YES		YES		YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T9D7	DS		YES	YES	YES		YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T9D8	DS		YES		YES		YES	YES			YES	YES	YES
T9D9	DS		YES	YES	YES		YES	YES		YES		YES	YES
T9D10	DS	YES	YES			YES			YES		YES		YES

**Appendix C***Staff / Office Use Only***DOPEC NUMBER: EHJL200617*****Umbrella project DOPEC number (staff)***\_\_\_\_\_**APPLICANT SURNAME:** *Holland***Please complete all questions by underlining the correct response to facilitate correct processing****APPLICANT:** UG PGT PGR STAFF**REVIEW PROCESS:** Accelerated / Full**APPLICATION STATUS:** NEW APPLICATION, MAJOR AMENDMENT, RESUBMISSION**APPLICATION FOR:** DISSERTATION, TEACHING, RESEARCH & PUBLICATION**ATTENDENCE AT HEALTH & SAFETY BRIEFING:** YES / NO / NA**INCLUSION OF RISK ASSESSMENT FORM:** YES / NO / NA**NOTES ON THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY ETHICS COMMITTEE.**

- *All decisions of the committee are based on the application form and reviewers comments ONLY. Forms should be as detailed and clear as possible. Verbal discussions are not considered as part of the application or review process.*
- *The review process strictly adheres to the University of Chester Research Governance Handbook and the BPS Code of Ethics.*
- *The decision of the committee is final. If you are a UG, PGT or PGR student you should discuss the decision of the committee with your supervisor. If you are a member of staff you may contact the chair of the committee for further clarification.*

Before completing the form researchers are expected to familiarise themselves with the regulatory codes and codes of conduct and ethics relevant to their areas of research, including those of relevant professional organisations and ensure that research which they propose is designed to comply with such codes.

Department of Psychology Ethical Approval for Research: Procedural Guidelines.

University of Chester Research Governance Handbook

[http://ganymede2.chester.ac.uk/view.php?title\\_id=522471](http://ganymede2.chester.ac.uk/view.php?title_id=522471)

BPS Code of Ethics

[http://www.bps.org.uk/system/files/Public%20files/bps\\_code\\_of\\_ethics\\_2009.pdf](http://www.bps.org.uk/system/files/Public%20files/bps_code_of_ethics_2009.pdf)

BPS Code of Human Research Ethics

[http://www.bps.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/code\\_of\\_human\\_research\\_ethics.pdf](http://www.bps.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/code_of_human_research_ethics.pdf)

BPS Guidelines for Internet-mediated Research

<i>Notes: Students to indicate where information is found, supervisor to confirm by ticking green column</i>	<u>Supervisor confirmation</u>	<u>Information sheet</u>	<u>Letter</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Email info. page</u>	<u>Consent Form</u>	<u>PowerPoint</u>	<u>N/A</u>
Brief details about the purpose of the study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contact details for further information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanation of how and why participant has been chosen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Notification that materials/interviews are not diagnostic tools/therapy or used for staff review/development purposes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Explanation participation is voluntary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Details of any incentives or compensation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Details of how consent will be obtained	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If research is observational, consent to being observed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Details of procedure so participants are informed about what to expect	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Details of time commitments expected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Details of any stimuli used	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Explanation of right to withdraw and right to withdraw procedure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Option for omitting questions participant does not wish to answer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Procedure regarding partially completed questionnaires or interviews	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
With interviews, information regarding time limit for withdrawal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Details of any advantages and benefits of taking part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Details of any disadvantages and risks of taking part	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Information that data will be treated with full confidentiality and that, if published, those data will not be identifiable as theirs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Debriefing details	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Dissemination information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Further information (relevant literature; support networks etc)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

**CHECK LIST.**

Please complete the form below indicating attached materials. Prior to submission supervisors must confirm that they have reviewed the application by completing the supervisors column.

**This is an investigation of pre-existing data that is in the public domain**

**Supervisor Signature:**

**Date:**

*Julian Lloyd*

*01.06.2017*

**DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY  
APPLICATION TO DEPARTMENTAL  
ETHICS COMMITTEE**



**University of  
Chester**

***IN COMPLETING THE FORM UG & PGT STUDENTS PLEASE REFER TO YOUR  
HANDBOOK***

**Question 1: Working title of the study**

*Notes: The title should be a single sentence*

Are pushy and helicopter parenting behaviours evident in parenting forums?

**Question 2: Applicant, name and contact details.**

*Notes: The primary applicant is the name of the person who has overall responsibility for the study. Include their appointment or position held and their qualifications. For studies where students and/or research assistants will undertake the research, the primary applicant is the student (UG, PGT, PGR) and supervisor is the co-applicant.*

Emily Holland

BA (Hons) Primary Education QTs

**Question 3: Co-applicants**

*Notes: List the names of all researchers involved in the study. Include their appointment or position held and their qualifications.*

Dissertation Supervisor: Dr Julian Lloyd  
Chartered Psychologist

**Question 4: What are the start and end dates of the study?**

*Notes: If exact dates are unavailable, explain why and give approximate dates.*

Start date: January 2017 (projects issued)  
Finish date: September 2017 (submission date)

**Question 5: Is this project subject to external funding?**

*Notes: Please provide details of the funding body, grant application and PI.*

This project is not subject to external funding.

**Question 6: Briefly describe the purpose and rationale of the research**

*Notes: In writing the rationale make sure that the research proposed is grounded in relevant literature, and the hypotheses emerge from recent research and are logically structured.*

*PGR / Staff if this application is for a funded project please attach any detailed research proposals as appropriate.*

*Maximum word length (300 words)*



Helicopter parenting has been defined as the overinvolvement of parents in their children's lives, that is not developmentally appropriate (Schiffrin, Liss, Miles-McLean, Geary, Erchull & Tashner, 2014; Schiffrin & Liss, 2017). Helicopter parents have been seen to have serious impacts upon their child's well-being and academic achievements (Reed, Duncan, Lucier-Greer, Fixelle & Ferraro, 2016; LeMoyne & Buchanan, 2011).

Helicopter Parenting involves developmentally inappropriate parenting tactics (Segrin, Givertz, Swaitkowski & Montgomery, 2015) as seen in families with fewer children (Bradley-Geist & Olson-Buchanan, 2014), with mainly mothers hovering over their children, in particular their daughters (Fingerman, Cheng, Wesselmann, Zarit, Furstenberg & Birditt, 2012; Manos, 2009). Some of the key characteristics of Helicopter Parenting involve behaviours such as parents making academic decisions for their children (van Ingen, Freiheit, Steinfeldt, Moore, Wimer, Knutt & Roberts, 2015), contacting teachers about their child's grades and assessment (Gibbs, 2009), having the desire to anticipate and solve their child's everyday problems (Schiffrin, Godfrey, Liss & Erchull, 2015) and organising their child's schedule, picking activities for them to do and friends for them to visit (McCarthy, 2011).

However, a 'pushy parent' is a conceptually vague and culturally-specific label implying the existence of antagonistic agent's intent on optimising their children's educational attainment (Beauvais, 2017). Children of pushy parents are known as 'trophy-children', who are overstretched to achieve highly because of a pressured environment, but where the activity or learning may not be academically or developmentally suited (Cigman, 2006; Freeman, 2010). Some parents may find the differences between support and encouragement, and controlling and overly ambitious, difficult to determine (Stone, 2010). Similarly, to helicopter parenting is the link between the developmentally inappropriate input and pressures for children of pushy and helicopter parents and the difference between supportive and controlling (Paton, 2013).

With pushy parenting, there is a fine line between encouragement and controlling behaviours (Chambers, 2006) hence why some of the traits of a pushy parent include the completion of homework and academic tasks (Bicknell, 2014), pressuring children academically (Rubie-Davies, Peterson, Irving, Widdowson & Dixon, 2010), competitive natures (Halliwell, 2015) and picking activities or sports for their children to participate in (Saner, 2015).

Overall, the main themes in relation to behaviours that emerge from a pushy and helicopter parenting are making academic decisions, interfering with extracurricular activities, organising their child's schedules, social group influences and solving their child's everyday problems. An extra theme that could be explored is the competitive nature of a pushy parent compared to the elaborate, controlling nature of a helicopter parent. These themes will be focused upon in the study as behaviours performed within these parenting styles.

With this in mind, the aim of this research is to find out whether parents in the UK are seen to be displaying pushy parenting or helicopter parenting behaviours and whether this is associated with a negative or positive orientation towards the educator and the child. The hypotheses therefore are:

1. There will be an association between helicopter/pushy parenting behaviour and whether the child is a girl or a boy (with more behaviour being shown towards girls than boys)
2. There will be an association between helicopter/pushy parenting behaviour and positive comments/orientation towards the child (with more behaviour being associated with

**Question 7: Describe the methods and procedures of the study**

*Notes: Attach any relevant material (questionnaires, supporting information etc.) as appendices and summarise them briefly here (e.g. Cognitive Failures Questionnaire: a standardised self-report measure on the frequency of everyday cognitive slips). Do not merely list the names of measures and/or their acronyms. Include information about any interventions, interview schedules, duration, order and frequency of assessments. It should be clear exactly what will happen to participants. If this is a media based study describe and list materials include links and sampling procedure. (500 words)*

## **Method**

Data for this study will consist of the analysis of a range of postings to a popular parenting online discussion forum Mumsnet. Mumsnet is a website for parents which hosts discussion forums where users share advice and information on parenting and many other topics. Online discussion forums have become a popular means of communicating and receiving support in a wide range of domains (Arden, Duxbury & Soltani, 2014). Using online forums to collect data can be a powerful resource for many reasons, such as people finding it easier to be their 'true selves' online (**Mandiberg, 2012**; Hadert & Rodham, 2008), **resulting in the anonymous use of the internet** displaying different behaviours to that in a social face-to-face context (Jung-Tae, Min-Chul & Hae-Chang, 2014), the opportunities to allow for voices that have previously been unheard (Bylund, 2005), the examination of naturalistic data (Jowett, 2015), the opportunity to allow researchers to target a diverse range of people (Gavin, Rodham & Poyer, 2008) and topics discussed in online forum threads can be subjective seeking personal opinions or non-subjective seeking factual information (Biyani, Caragea, Singh & Mitra, 2012). Although recognised are some of the ethical issues such as not being able to support participants through debriefings due to anonymity, leading to the disclosure of concerning information (Buchanan, 2004).

Forum users will not be notified of the research, because the data that will be collected will not obtain informed consent. However, individuals posting onto an open forum are aware that their message can be read by anyone who has access to the internet (Rodham & Gavin, 2006). Messages posted on this forum are accessible to anybody who has access to the Internet and therefore does not raise concerns of invasion of privacy (Rodham, McCabe & Blake, 2009).

## **Procedure**

Due to the nature of the study, a content analysis, the categories will be defined before the analysis begins, they will not 'emerge' from the data (Liamputtong, 2012). Using a directed approach, analysis starts with a theory or relevant research findings as guidance for initial codes (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Therefore, the literature used will describe the characteristics of pushing and Helicopter Parenting, enabling a clear definition of the different behaviours associated with the parenting style. Furthermore, the behaviours related to these parenting styles will be used when analysing the conversation of threads, identifying whether certain parents display helicopter parenting traits. Therefore, the data will be collected through the identification of behaviours associated with Helicopter Parenting (as defined in the rationale) in the parent discussion groups on Mumsnet, for example during the discussion on the forum of Education - Gifted and Talented Children. To analyse the data collected, content analytical approaches will be used as a research method, providing a systematic and objective means of describing and quantifying phenomena (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Willig 2013). Content analysis is a research method for making replicable and valid inferences from data to their context, with the purpose of providing knowledge, new insights, a representation of facts and a practical guide to action (Krippendorff, 1980). A code will be devised based on the themes identified in the literature. The code for identifying pushy and helicopter parenting behaviour is as followed:

1. Academic decisions
2. Interfering with extracurricular activities
3. Solving problems for their children
4. Organisation of their children's schedule
5. Controlling attitudes

Coding will also be implemented for any correlations between orientation displayed towards the child and educator. The code is as followed:

1. Positive for the child
2. Negative for the child
3. Positive for the teacher
4. Negative for the teacher

Positive comments will be associated with the praise and 'bragging' of children of teachers, whereas negative comments will be linked with aggression and will display blame towards other parties.

The gender of the child will also be coded as male, female or unspecified, as well as a code for the social context in which the event took place.

The study would aim to look at around 70 posts, roughly 10 identified for each group ranging from 2010 and 2017,

**Question 8: Has the person carrying out the study had previous experience of the procedures? If not, who will supervise that person?**

*Notes: Say who will be undertaking the procedures involved and what training and/or experience they have. If supervision is necessary, indicate who will provide it.*

Similar university assessments for the following modules PS7301 and PS7302 have been performed, using similar methods for online data collection and analysis. Dr Julian Lloyd will also support and supervise the project, with an interest in Helicopter Parenting and experience of similar studies.

**Question 9: What ethical issues does this study raise and what measures have been taken to address them?**

*Notes: Describe any discomfort or inconvenience that participants may experience. Include information about procedures that for some people could be physically stressful or might impact on the safety of participants, e.g. interviews, probing questions, noise levels, visual stimuli, equipment; or that for some people could be psychologically stressful, e.g. mood induction procedures, tasks with high failure rate. Discuss any issues of anonymity and confidentiality as they relate to your study, refer to ethics handbook and guidance notes at the end of the form. If animal based include ethical issues relating to observation.*

The main ethical issues have been considered when designing, implementing or assessing an IMR (Internet-mediated research) study, as found and read in the BPS Internet-mediated Research guidelines, which involve respect for the autonomy and dignity of persons, scientific value, social responsibility and maximising benefits and minimising harm (British Psychological Society, 2013).

The data for the study will be collected through open discussion forums on the website Mumsnet. All discussions published on this website are in the public domain. Discussions posted on this forum are accessible to anybody who has access to the Internet (Reid, 2016). There are some who take the view that messages posted to publically accessible forums are in the public domain; therefore, institutional ethical review and gaining consent from the contributors to online forums are unnecessary (Seale, Charteris-Black, MacFarlane & McPherson, 2010; Walther, 2002). Hence, the submission of their comment within the discussion on the forum will be used as informed consent, as the individual is publicly posting their views for anybody to access (Jowett, 2015). Furthermore, the BPS (2013) state the “use of research data without gaining valid consent may be justifiable” (p7). Although, it is recognised that much internet communication is conducted in both a private and public location simultaneously and awareness has been made that participants may consider their publicly accessible internet activity to be private despite agreeing to the terms of the web service (British Psychological Society, 2013). This links in with the notion of maintaining respect for and avoidance of disrupting social structures (British Psychological Society, 2013).

Maximal anonymisation procedures will be implemented, such as using the user’s untraceable user names. A further step of not using user names in the report will be taken by using random initials to identify individuals when analysing and reporting the data (Roberts, 2015; Rodham et al., 2009). Throughout the data collection and analyses confidentiality will be maintained of the individuals who have ‘posted’ and data will be recorded in a manner that would not cause personal identification (Warrell et al., 2014). Any quotes or material used from the website in the study will be ran searched through google to make sure it is not traceable to the website and any individual persons (Rodham et al., 2009; Brotsky & Giles, 2007).). If the user deletes their comment, this will form their right to withdraw from the study (BPS, 2013).

#### **Question 10: Who will the participants be?**

*Notes: Describe the groups of participants that will be recruited and the principal eligibility criteria and ineligibility criteria. Make clear how many participants you plan to recruit into the study in total.*

The sample for this study will be identified through online discussion forums posted to the Web site <https://www.mumsnet.com/>. This is a public Web site targeted at parents' who need knowledge, advice and support on everything from conception to childbirth, from babies to teenagers. Joining a discussion requires registration for a person to post on a discussion but not to view the discussions that have been previously posted.

The main users of Mumsnet are mothers, although it isn't exclusive to mums, however some information can be obtained about the users from their username such as whether they are male or female. Although, Mumsnet is a global online network but most of their users are UK-based, giving a regional and even global sample. Due to the nature of the study, the database will have to be parents; this can be identifiable in the wording of their discussions. For consistency, discussions not written by parents, identifying their gender and children's gender will be skipped.

A range of discussions will be analysed on Mumsnet in relation to Helicopter Parenting, how much data will be needed will depend on the type of threads that tend to be relevant.

#### **Question 11: Describe participant recruitment procedures for the study**

*Notes: Gives details of how potential participants will be identified or recruited. Include all advertising materials (social media messages, posters, emails, letters, verbal script etc.) as appendices and refer to them as appropriate. Describe any screening examinations. If it serves to explain the procedures better, include as an appendix a flow chart and refer to it.*

A parent database both male and female will be developed through discussion forums on <https://www.mumsnet.com/> related to the topic of Helicopter Parenting.

The consent to use people's thoughts, views, opinions and experiences as data in this study will be obtained through the publishing of these on an open, online forum for anyone to access. Therefore, anonymity and confidentiality will be key in ensuring the data is untraceable and unidentifiable.

#### **Question 12: Describe the procedures to obtain informed consent**

*Notes: Describe when consent will be obtained. If consent is from **adult participants**, give details of who will take consent and how it will be done. If you plan to seek informed consent from **vulnerable groups** (e.g. people with learning difficulties, victims of crime), say how you will ensure that consent is voluntary and fully informed.*

*If you are recruiting **children or young adults** (aged under 18 years) specify the age-range of participants and describe the arrangements for seeking informed consent from a person with parental responsibility. If you intend to provide children under 16 with information about the study and seek agreement, outline how this process will vary according to their age and level of understanding.*

*How long will you allow potential participants to decide whether or not to take part? What arrangements have been made for people who might not adequately understand verbal explanations or written information given in English, or who have special communication needs?*

*If you are not obtaining consent, explain why not.*

Informed consent will not be obtained as this project uses data in the public domain, the usual principles underlying data collection are not relevant. The submission of the users thoughts, views, opinions and experiences on a public, online, accessible forum will be considered consent, as after they publish their views they can be accessed by any online users and the publisher is aware of this.

### **Question 13: Will consent be written?**

No (delete as appropriate)

*Notes: If **yes**, include a consent form as an appendix. If **no**, describe and justify an alternative procedure (verbal, electronic etc.) in the space below.*

*Guidance on how to draft Participant Information sheet and Consent form can be found on PS6001 Moodle space and in the Handbook.*

Collecting data online can be ethically plausible if the source of data collection is viewed as being in the public domain and the information posted on the web is posted in a public space which is easily accessed by anyone, it is seen as being open to being included in research data (Warrell & Jacobsen, 2014; Sharkey, Jones, Smithson, Hewis, Emmens, Ford & Owens, 2011).

**Question 14: What will participants be told about the study? Will any information on procedures or the purpose of study be withheld?**

*Notes: Include an Information Sheet that sets out the purpose of the study and what will be required of the participant as appendices and refer to it as appropriate. If any information is to be withheld, justify this decision. More than one Information Sheet may be necessary.*

Again, as this project will use data in the public domain, the usual principles underlying data collection are not relevant. The users will be unaware of the study, as the submission of their views on the accessible, open, public forum will counteract as consent.

**Question 15: Will personally identifiable information be made available beyond the research team (e.g. report to organisation)?**

*Notes: If so, indicate to whom and describe how confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained at all stages.*

Due to the nature of the data collection, online forums, there is already a decrease in identifiable information, other than a username and the wording in discussion to distinguish whether the user is a parent and are male or female. However, further step of not using these user names in the report will be taken, by using random initials to identify individuals when analysing and reporting the data. Also, any quotes used from the forum will be put through a google search to ensure they are cannot be traced back to the participant or website.

**Question 16: What payments, expenses or other benefits and inducements will participants receive?**

*Notes: Give details. If it is monetary say how much, how it will be paid and on what basis is the amount determined. Indicate RPS credits.*



Due to the nature of this study, the users will not receive any payments, expenses or other benefits and inducements.

**Question 17: At the end of the study, what will participants be told about the investigation?**

*Notes: Give details of debriefings, ways of alleviating any distress that might be caused by the study and ways of dealing with any clinical problem that may arise relating to the focus of the study.*

Again, as this project uses data in the public domain, the usual principles underlying data collection are not relevant. The users that form the database will be unaware their posts made public on an online, accessible forum are being used as data for this study. This is due to the untraceable information on the forum (just a username), resulting in there being no way of contacting the participants to inform them of the study.

**Question 18: What arrangements are there for data security during and after the study?**

*Notes: Digital data stored on a computer requires compliance with the Data Protection Act; indicate if you have discussed this with your supervisor and describe any special circumstances that have been identified from that discussion. Say who will have access to participants' personal data and for how long personal data will be stored or accessed after the study has ended.*

All analysed data will be kept in a password protected account until no longer needed, where all files will be deleted. All usernames related to the data from the online forums will be changed to random initials. At the end of data collection, history browsing will be deleted after each search on the forum. Finally, any of the quotes used from the forum in the study will be 'googled' to ensure they cannot be traced back to the participant.

**Signatures of the study team (including date)**

*Notes: The primary applicant and all co-applicants must sign and date the form. Scanned or electronic signatures are acceptable.*

EBMHOLLAND 30/05/17

**ETHICS COMMITTEE DATE:**

**CHAIRS COMMENTS:**

☐ **Read and address all reviewers comments**

**ACCEPTABLE**

☒ **Action: You may now commence with data collection subject to approval from any relevant external agencies.**

**DATA COLLECTION IS NOT PERMISSABLE UNDER THESE CONDITIONS**

☐ **ACCEPTABLE SUBJECT TO SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENT FORM**

☐ **Acceptable subject to conditions listed by chair. Discuss conditions highlighted with supervisor and submit ethics application amendment form direct to office.**

☐ **Acceptable subject to conditions listed by chair: Submit ethics application amendment form direct to office.**

**ACCEPTABLE SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS LISTED BY CHAIR:**

☐ **Action: Resubmit application for full review ensuring you have completed section B**

**REVISE AND RESUBMIT:**

☐ **Action: Resubmit application for full review ensuring you have completed section B**

**SIGNATURE:** Moira E. Lafferty

### Reference List

- Arden, M. A., Duxbury, A. M. S., & Soltani, H. (2014). Responses to gestational weight management guidance: A thematic analysis of comments made by women in online parenting forums. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 14(1), 216-216. doi:10.1186/1471-2393-14-216
- Beauvais, C. (2017). An exploration of the 'pushy parent' label in educational discourse. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 38(2), 159-13. doi:10.1080/01596306.2015.1064098
- Bicknell, B. (2014). Parental roles in the education of mathematically gifted and talented children. *Gifted Child Today*, 37(2), 83-93. doi:10.1177/1076217513497576
- Biyani, P., Caragea, C., Singh, A., & Mitra, P. (2012). I want what i need: Analyzing subjectivity of online forum threads. Paper presented at the 2495-2498. doi:10.1145/2396761.2398675
- Bradley-Geist, J., & Olson-Buchanan, J. (2014). Helicopter parents: An examination of the correlates of over-parenting of college students. *Education + Training*, 56(4), 314-328. doi:10.1108/ET-10-2012-0096
- British Psychological Society (2013). Ethics Guidelines for Internet-mediated Research. INF206/1.2013. Leicester: Author. Available from: [www.bps.org.uk/publications/policy-andguidelines/research-guidelines-policydocuments/research-guidelines-policy](http://www.bps.org.uk/publications/policy-andguidelines/research-guidelines-policydocuments/research-guidelines-policy)
- Brotsky, S. R., & Giles, D. (2007). Inside the "pro-ana" community: A covert online participant observation. *Eating Disorders*, 15(2), 93-109. doi:10.1080/10640260701190600
- Buchanan, E. A. (2004). *Readings in virtual research ethics: Issues and controversies*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Pub.
- Bylund, C. L. (2005). Mothers' involvement in decision making during the birthing process: A quantitative analysis of women's online birth stories. *Health Communication*, 18(1), 23-39. doi:10.1207/s15327027hc1801\_2
- Chambers, J. C. (2006). "stop being so pushy!" applying the conflict cycle in work with families. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 15(3), 179.
- Cigman, R. (2006). The Gifted Child: A Conceptual Enquiry. *Oxford Review of Education*, 32, 197-212.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x
- Fingerman, K. L., Cheng, Y., Wesselmann, E. D., Zarit, S., Furstenberg, F., & Birditt, K. S. (2012). Helicopter parents and landing pad kids: Intense parental support of grown children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(4), 880-896. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00987.x
- Freeman, J. (2010). *Gifted Lives: What Happens When Gifted Children Grow Up*. London: Routledge.
- Gavin, J., Rodham, K., & Poyer, H. (2008). The presentation of "Pro-anorexia" in online group interactions. *Qualitative Health Research*, 18(3), 325-333. doi:10.1177/1049732307311640
- Gibbs, N. (2009), "The growing backlash against overparenting", *Time Magazine*, available at: [www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1940697,00.html](http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1940697,00.html) (accessed May 30, 2017).
- Hadert, A., & Rodham, K. (2008). The invisible reality of arthritis: A qualitative analysis of an online message board. *Musculoskeletal Care*, 6(3), 181-196. doi:10.1002/msc.131
- Halliwell, R. (2015). I'm a recovering pushy parent; as 80 per cent of mothers admit to being ferociously competitive, rachel halliwell reveals why she took her foot off the pedal. *Daily Telegraph (London, England)*
- Hsieh, H., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288. doi:10.1177/1049732305276687

- Jowett, A. (2015). A case for using online discussion forums in critical psychological research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12(3), 287-297. doi:10.1080/14780887.2015.1008906
- Jung-Tae, L., Min-Chul, Y., & Hae-Chang, R. (2014). Discovering high-quality threaded discussions in online forums. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, 29(3), 519-531. doi:10.1007/s11390-014-1446-5
- Krippendorff K. (1980) Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology. Sage Publications, Newbury Park.
- LeMoyné, T., & Buchanan, T. (2011). does "hovering" matter? helicopter parenting and its effect on well-being. *Sociological Spectrum*, 31(4), 399-418. doi:10.1080/02732173.2011.574038
- Liamputtong, P. (2012). Qualitative research methods (4th ed.). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press
- Mandiberg, M. (2012). The social media reader (1st ed.). Chesham: University Press.
- Manos, M. A. (2009). Helicopter parents: Empathetic or pathetic? when best intentions for adult children go awry at school and on the job. *Phi Kappa Phi Forum*, 89(3), 21.
- McCarthy, C. (2011). 'helicopter parenting' -- when too much help is no help. *Harvard Health Publications. Harvard Commentaries on Health*
- Paton, G. (2013). Pushy 'helicopter parents' put universities off their children. *Daily Telegraph (London, England)*
- Reed, K., Duncan, J. M., Lucier-Greer, M., Fixelle, C., & Ferraro, A. J. (2016). Helicopter parenting and emerging adult self-efficacy: Implications for mental and physical health. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25(10), 3136. doi:10.1007/s10826-016-0466-x
- Reid, A. (2016). The use and abuse of research in the public domain. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 43(1), 75-91. doi:10.1007/s13384-015-0184-1
- Roberts, L. D. (2015). Ethical issues in conducting qualitative research in online communities. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12(3), 314-325. doi:10.1080/14780887.2015.1008909
- Rodham K, Gavin J (2006). The ethics of using the internet to collect qualitative research data. *Research Ethics Review* 2: 83–116.
- Rodham, K., McCabe, C., & Blake, D. (2009). Seeking support: An interpretative phenomenological analysis of an internet message board for people with complex regional pain syndrome. *Psychology & Health*, 24(6), 619-634. doi:10.1080/08870440802563245
- Rubie-Davies, C. M., Peterson, E., Irving, E., Widdowson, D., & Dixon, R. (2010). Expectations of achievement: Student, teacher and parent perceptions. *Research in Education*, (83), 36.
- Saner, E. (2015). Are pushy parents putting children off sport? *The Guardian*
- Schiffrin, H. H., Liss, M., Miles-McLean, H., Geary, K. A., Erchull, M. J., & Tashner, T. (2014). Helping or hovering? the effects of helicopter parenting on college students' well-being. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 23(3), 548-557. doi:10.1007/s10826-013-9716-3
- Schiffrin, H. H., Godfrey, H., Liss, M., & Erchull, M. J. (2015). Intensive parenting: Does it have the desired impact on child outcomes? *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 24(8), 2322-2331. doi:10.1007/s10826-014-0035-0
- Schiffrin, H. H., & Liss, M. (2017). The effects of helicopter parenting on academic motivation. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 26(5), 1472. doi:10.1007/s10826-017-0658-z
- Seale, C., Charteris-Black, J., MacFarlane, A., & McPherson, A. (2010). Interviews and Internet forums: a comparison of two sources of qualitative data, *Qualitative Health Research*, 20(5), 595–606.
- Segrin, C., Givertz, M., Swaitkowski, P., & Montgomery, N. (2015). Overparenting is associated with child problems and a critical family environment. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 24(2), 470-479. doi:10.1007/s10826-013-9858-3

- Sharkey, S., Jones, R., Smithson, J., Hewis, E., Emmens, T., Ford, T., & Owens, C. (2011). Ethical practice in internet research involving vulnerable people: Lessons from a self-harm discussion forum study (sharp talk). *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 37(12), 752-758. doi:10.1136/medethics-2011-100080
- Stone, T. (2010). Pushy parents: Problems, tips and techniques. *Child Care*, 7(4), 22-23. doi:10.12968/chca.2010.7.4.47183
- van Ingen, D. J., Freiheit, S. R., Steinfeldt, J. A., Moore, L. L., Wimer, D. J., Knutt, A. D., & Roberts, A. (2015). Helicopter parenting: The effect of an overbearing caregiving style on peer attachment and Self-Efficacy. *Journal of College Counseling*, 18(1), 7-20. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1882.2015.00065.x
- Walther, J. B. (2002). Research ethics in Internet-enabled research: human subjects issues and methodological myopia', *Ethics and Information Technology*, 4(3), 205–16.
- Warrell, J. G., & Jacobsen, M. (2014). Internet research ethics and the policy gap for ethical practice in online research settings. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 44(1), 22.
- Willig, C. (2013). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology: Adventures in theory and method* (3rd ed.). Maidenhead: Open University Press.



**UNIVERSITY OF CHESTER DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY  
APPLICATION FOR ETHICAL APPROVAL REVIEW FORM**

**A) Applicant and submission details**

**Name of applicant:** *Emily Holland*

**Project title:** *Helicopter parents*

**Applicant status:** ☐ Staff → Go to Section B. Application should follow the procedure for full review.

☒ PGR ☐ UG ☐ PGT

**If you are the applicant's supervisor, have you discussed ethical issues with the applicant?**

☒ Yes, the applicant is an UG/PGT student and I wish to send the application for accelerated student review.

☐ Yes, the applicant is an UG/PGT student and I wish to send the application for full review.

☐ Yes, the applicant is a PGR student and I wish to send the application for full review.

☐ No → Comments: *Click here to enter text.*

**B) Review of application**

**1. Has the applicant signed and dated the form?**

a) ☒ Yes → Go to Q2 ☐ No → Return to applicant for signature before continuing with review process.

**2. What is the submission type?**

a) ☒ First submission to this or any other committee

b) ☐ Resubmission of a rejected application by this committee

↳ Is there a summary of the requirements of the committee? Is the original application attached?:

☐ Yes ☐ No → Return to applicant for full details

c) ☐ Revised submission intended to replace an application approved by this committee

↳ Is the original application attached?: ☐ Yes ☐ No → Return to applicant for full details

d) ☐ First submission to this committee; has been submitted to another committee.

↳ Is the original application attached? ☐ Yes ☐ No → Return to applicant for full details

**3. Research Plan and Methodology**

a) Is the study well formulated in terms of drawing on the relevant literature and is it methodologically, analytically and scientifically sound?

☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: *Click here to enter text.*

b) Are the timescales provided appropriate?

☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: *Click here to enter text.*

c) Are there contingency details?

☐ Yes ☒ No Comments:

d) Is there consideration of how to minimise, manage and monitor issues of distress and harm, however minor?

☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: *No participants*

e) Are appropriate debrief details provided?

☐ Yes ☒ No Comments:



- f) Are appropriate details regarding the use and management of deception provided?  
☒ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A Comments: *Click here to enter text.*

#### 4. Sample size, participants and recruitment

- a) Has the applicant provided appropriate details of the sample and how it will be identified? (this information will be in Q11, Q12, Q13, Q17, Q18, Q20, Q21)  
☐ Yes ☐ No Comments: *no participants*
- b) Has the applicant provided appropriate details of where the research will take place, including issues regarding permission and appropriate health and safety information? Is the necessary documentation attached?  
☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: *n/a. Data is from Mumsnet posts, which is in the public domain*  
 If the applicant is a taught student and they did not attend the mandatory H&S briefing have they provided appropriate evidence that they have full and satisfactory awareness of the relevant health and safety protocol?  
☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A Comments: *Click here to enter text.*
- c) Has the applicant provided appropriate details and attached the necessary documentation concerning their recruitment procedures? In particular, have they appropriately considered how to minimise, manage and monitor issues of distress and harm?  
☐ Yes ☐ No Comments: *n/a*  
 Are there appropriate SONA credits? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A
- d) Has the applicant provided appropriate details and attached the necessary documentation concerning the information made available to participants? In particular, are there appropriate considerations if using internet mediated research?  
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments:  
 Is there appropriate consideration of how to manage issues of distress and harm?  
☐ Yes ☐ No Comments: *n/a*  
 Are there appropriate details regarding informed consent?  
☐ Yes ☐ No Comments: *n/a*  
 Are there appropriate details regarding anonymity and confidentiality?  
☐ Yes ☐ No Comments: *data already anonymised*  
 Are there appropriate details regarding withdrawal procedures?  
☐ Yes ☐ No Comments: *n/a*
- e) Are there appropriate details regarding time commitment from participants?  
☐ Yes ☐ No Comments: *n/a*
- f) Are there appropriate details regarding compensation arrangements?  
☐ Yes ☒ No Comments:

#### 5. Data Collection and Analysis

- a) Has the applicant provided full procedural details and attached the necessary documentation concerning data collection procedures?  
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: *archival data*

#### 6. Data Analysis

- a) Has the applicant provided appropriate details concerning data analysis?  
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: *archival data*

**7. Data Protection and Storage**

- a) Has the applicant provided appropriate details concerning data protection and storage? Have security issues been properly considered?

☒ Yes ☐ No Comments:

**8. Dissemination**

- a) Has the applicant provided appropriate details concerning research dissemination?

☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Are there appropriate details regarding how privacy and confidentiality will be maintained during dissemination?

☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Are there appropriate details regarding any specific considerations about sharing the research?

☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

General comments: No issues. Archival data in the public domain.

**Review status**

- ☐ Staff/PGR for full review ☐ UG/PGT for full review ☐ UG/PGT Chair's action  
☐ Work with external agencies ☐ Work with vulnerable participants  
☐ Other concerns/discussion points [Click here to enter text.](#)

**NAME:**

☒ Supervisor ☒ Supervisor/Reviewer 1 ☐ Reviewer 2 ☐ Reviewer 3

**DATE:** 13/06/2017

**Signature:**





University of  
Chester

**DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY  
ETHICS REVIEW FORM**

**A) Applicant and submission details**

Name of applicant: Emily Holland

Project title: Are pushy and helicopter parenting behaviours evident in parenting forums?

Applicant status: ☐ UG ☒ PGT ☐ PGR ☐ Staff

If you are the applicant's supervisor, have you discussed ethical issues with the applicant?

☐ Yes, the applicant is an UG/PGT student and I wish to send the application for accelerated student review.

☐ Yes, the applicant is a UG/PGT student and I wish to send the application for full review.

☐ Yes, the applicant is a PGR student and I wish to send the application for full review.

☐ No → Comments:

**B) Review of application**

**1. Has the applicant signed and dated the form?**

a) ☒ Yes ☐ No → Return to applicant for signature before continuing with review process.

**2. What is the submission type?**

a) ☐ First submission to this or any other committee

b) ☒ Resubmission of a rejected application by this committee

• Is there a summary of the requirements of the committee? Is the original application attached?: ☐ Yes ☐ No → Return to applicant for full details

c) ☐ Revised submission intended to replace an application approved by this committee

• Is the original application attached?: ☐ Yes ☐ No → Return to applicant for full details

d) ☐ First submission to this committee; has been submitted to another committee.

• Is the original application attached? ☐ Yes ☐ No → Return to applicant for full details

**3. Research Plan and Methodology**

a) Is the study well formulated in terms of drawing on the relevant literature and is it methodologically, analytically and scientifically sound?

☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: Student needs to think about how many people will need to be approached exactly. Currently a sample size is given, though no indication of how many will need to be solicited before reaching this amount is provided. For her own expectations, Student should consider this.

b) Are the timescales provided appropriate?

☒ Yes ☐ No Comments:

c) Are there contingency details?

☒ Yes ☐ No Comments:

d) Is there consideration of how to minimise, manage and monitor issues of distress and harm, however minor?

☒ Yes ☐ No      Comments:

e) Are appropriate debrief details provided?

☒ Yes ☐ No      Comments:

f) Are appropriate details regarding the use and management of deception provided?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A      Comments:

#### 4. Sample size, participants and recruitment

a) Has the applicant provided appropriate details of the sample and how it will be identified?

☒ Yes ☐ No      Comments:

b) Has the applicant provided appropriate details of where the research will take place, including issues regarding permission and appropriate health and safety information? Is the necessary documentation attached?

☒ Yes ☐ No      Comments:

If the applicant is a taught student and they did not attend the mandatory H&S briefing have they provided appropriate evidence that they have full and satisfactory awareness of the relevant health and safety protocol?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A      Comments:

c) Has the applicant provided appropriate details and attached the necessary documentation concerning their recruitment procedures? In particular, have they appropriately considered how to minimise, manage and monitor issues of distress and harm?

☒ Yes ☐ No      Comments:

Are there appropriate RPS credits?      ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

d) Has the applicant provided appropriate details and attached the necessary documentation concerning the information made available to participants? In particular, are there appropriate considerations if using internet mediated research?

☒ Yes ☐ No      Comments:

Is there appropriate consideration of how to manage issues of distress and harm?

☒ Yes ☐ No      Comments:

Are there appropriate details regarding informed consent?

☒ Yes ☐ No      Comments:

Are there appropriate details regarding anonymity and confidentiality?

☒ Yes ☐ No      Comments:

Are there appropriate details regarding withdrawal procedures?

☒ Yes ☐ No      Comments:

e) Are there appropriate details regarding time commitment from participants?

☒ Yes ☐ No      Comments:

f) Are there appropriate details regarding compensation arrangements?

☒ Yes ☐ No      Comments:

- g) If using social media for recruitment have details been provided on
- Proposed sites and social groups?  
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments:
  - Social media messages?  
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments:
5. **Data Collection and Analysis**
- Has the applicant provided full procedural details and attached the necessary documentation concerning data collection procedures?  
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments:
6. **Data Analysis**
- Has the applicant provided appropriate details concerning data analysis?  
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments:
7. **Data protection and Storage**
- Has the applicant provided appropriate details concerning data protection and storage? Have security issues been properly considered?  
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments:
8. **Dissemination**
- Has the applicant provided appropriate details concerning research dissemination?  
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments:  
Are there appropriate details regarding how privacy and confidentiality will be maintained during dissemination?  
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments:  
Are there appropriate details regarding any specific considerations about sharing the research?  
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments:

General comments: This studies – if anonymisation protocol is followed, raises no apparent ethical concerns.

**Review status**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chair's action              | <input type="checkbox"/> UG/PGT for full review            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Staff/PGR for full review   | <input type="checkbox"/> Work with vulnerable participants |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Work with external agencies |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other issues/concerns       |  |

**NAME:** Dr Kevin Hochard

☐ Supervisor ☐ Supervisor/Reviewer 1 ☒ Reviewer 1 ☐ Reviewer 2

**DATE:** 14-06-2017